

Divisors of Bernoulli sums

Michel WEBER

Abstract: Let $B_n = b_1 + \dots + b_n$, $n \geq 1$ where $b_1, b_2, \dots$ are independent Bernoulli random variables. In relation with the divisor problem, we evaluate the almost sure asymptotic order of the sums $\sum_{n=1}^N d_{\theta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n)$, where $d_{\theta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n) = \#\{d \in \mathcal{D}, d \leq n^\theta : d|B_n\}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is a sequence of positive integers.

1. Introduction and main results

We begin with discussing a simple problem. Let $d(n) = \#\{y : y|n\}$ be the divisor function, and consider also the prime divisor function $\omega(n) = \#\{p \text{ prime} : p|n\}$. Let $\beta = \{\beta_i, i \geq 1\}$ be a Bernoulli sequence and denote $B_n = \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_n$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$ the sequence of associated partial sums. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P})$ be the underlying basic probability space. It is natural to consider the sequence of sums

$$\sum_{n=1}^N d(B_n), \quad N = 1, 2, \dots$$

and ask for which nondecreasing functions (optimal if possible) $\Phi_1, \Phi_2 : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$, the following almost sure asymptotic behavior can be established:

$$\sum_{n=1}^N d(B_n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \Phi_1(N) + \mathcal{O}(\Phi_2(N)). \quad (1.1)$$

A similar question can naturally be raised relatively to the prime divisor function $\omega(n)$. Before giving an arithmetical motivation for studying this problem, we would like to begin with a first necessary comment. A result of this sort cannot be obtained from the knowledge of the similar known result for the deterministic sums:

$$\sum_{n=1}^N d(n) = \varphi_1(N) + \mathcal{O}(\varphi_2(N)). \quad (1.2)$$

Indeed, the two sums $\sum_{n=1}^N d(B_n)$ and $\sum_{n=1}^N d(n)$ are different, the first contains terms which appear with some multiplicity, the order of this one can be bounded by $c \log n$, n large, almost surely. And the natural idea to use the law of the iterated logarithm ($\forall \varepsilon > 0$)

$$\left| B_n - \frac{n}{2} \right| \leq \sqrt{(1 + \varepsilon)n \log \log n} \quad n \text{ ultimately,} \quad \text{almost surely.} \quad (1.3)$$

in order to exploit (1.2) will give a less precise result than the one expected in (1.1). The law of the iterated logarithm in (1.3) involves intervals of integers of the type $[m, m + C\sqrt{m \log \log m}]$.

Date: on February 22, 2008

AMS Subject Classification 2000: Primary 11M06, Secondary 11M99, 11A25, 60G50.

Keywords: Bernoulli random variables, iid, Theta functions, divisors.

The study of the size of the divisor function $d(n)$ for n varying in intervals of this type or $[m, m + C\sqrt{m}]$, is usually known as the model of small intervals. Here the problem considered involves another (probabilistic) model, the one generated by the complete Bernoulli random walk; and so relies upon the study of the asymptotic evolution of the system

$$\{d(B_n), n \geq 1\}.$$

We are thus led to a probabilistic question and the first natural object of investigation should consist of making a complete second order theory of the above system, more precisely, a study of the correlation

$$\mathbf{E} d(B_n)d(B_m) - \mathbf{E} d(B_n)\mathbf{E} d(B_m) \quad m > n, \quad (1.4)$$

and preliminarily of (denoting χ the indicator function)

$$\mathbf{E} \chi(d|B_n)\chi(\delta|B_m) - \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\}\mathbf{P}\{\delta|B_m\} \quad m > n. \quad (1.5)$$

Such a study turns up to depend, via the use of characteristic functions, on a careful analysis on the circle of some naturally related *cosine* sums.

An arithmetical motivation to the study of (1.1) can be easily provided. Unlike to what happens for the sum $\sum_{n=1}^N \omega(n)$, where very accurate estimations of the order of magnitude are known, the similar problem for the sum $\sum_{n=1}^N d(n)$ contains a yet unsolved and certainly quite hard conjecture. For the comments we shall now make, we refer to the paper [IM] of Iwaniec and Mozzochi. More precisely, let

$$D(x) = \sum_{1 \leq n \leq x} d(n), \quad \Delta(x) = D(x) - x \log x - (2\gamma - 1)x, \quad (1.6)$$

where γ is Euler's constant, and let θ_0 be the smallest value of θ such that $\Delta(x) \ll x^{\theta+\varepsilon}$. It is conjectured since the papers of Hardy (1916) and Ingham (1940) that $\theta_0 = 1/4$. The best known result is (see the quoted paper) $\theta = 7/22 \approx 0,31181818\dots$. The study of the correlation problem described before should allow to obtain as corollary, via a suitable form of Gál-Koksma's Theorems, a result of the type

$$\sum_{1 \leq n \leq x} d(B_n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \sum_{1 \leq n \leq x} \mathbf{E} d(B_n) + \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon \left(\left(\sum_{1 \leq n \leq x} \mathbf{E} d(B_n) \right)^{1/2+\varepsilon} \right). \quad (1.7)$$

Similarly the study of the quadruple correlation

$$\mathbf{E} (d(B_n) - \mathbf{E} d(B_n))(d(B_m) - \mathbf{E} d(B_m))(d(B_p) - \mathbf{E} d(B_p))(d(B_q) - \mathbf{E} d(B_q)) \quad (1.8)$$

would provide by means of the same convergence criteria a result of the type:

$$\sum_{1 \leq n \leq x} d(B_n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \sum_{1 \leq n \leq x} \mathbf{E} d(B_n) + \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon \left(\left(\sum_{1 \leq n \leq x} \mathbf{E} d(B_n) \right)^{1/4+\varepsilon} \right). \quad (1.9)$$

That the above could be derived from (1.8) is already a remarkable fact; and it is clear from the very form of this result, also in the light of the Dirichlet conjecture, that it would be of considerable interest in succeeding to prove (1.9). Even a weaker form of it involving the truncated divisor function $d_\theta(m) = \#\{y \leq m^\theta : y|m\}$, ($\theta \leq 1/2$) would be also remarkable. In this paper, we explore the correlation problem of order two (thus related to (1.4), (1.5)) and obtain almost

sure results towards (1.1). Consider as well divisor functions defined with respect to a prescribed set $\mathcal{D}$ of integers. Define

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(n) = d_{\theta, \mathcal{D}}(n) = \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D} \\ d \leq n^\theta}} \mathbf{1}_{\{d|n\}}. \quad (1.10)$$

The order of magnitude of this generalized divisor function (with $\theta = 1/2$) was examined in [We4] with the help of a randomization argument (see related works in [BW], [We1-4]). Let also $\eta > 0$. For divisors related to Bernoulli sums we put similarly

$$d_{\eta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n) = \sum_{\substack{d < \eta \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ d \in \mathcal{D}}} d_{\theta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n) = \sum_{\substack{d \leq n^\theta \\ d \in \mathcal{D}}} \mathbf{1}_{\{d|B_n\}}.$$

The main purpose of the present study will consist of establishing limit theorems for the sums

$$\sum_{n=1}^N d_{\theta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n), \quad \sum_{\substack{n \leq N \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} d_{\eta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n) \quad (1.11)$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is an increasing sequence of positive integers. The difficult case is $\mathcal{N} = \mathbf{N}$ and our results will be then less precise than in the subsequence case. When $\mathcal{N} = \{\nu_k, k \geq 1\}$ satisfies for some $\rho > 0$ the growth condition

$$\nu_{k+1} - \nu_k \geq C\nu_k^\rho, \quad k \geq 1. \quad (\mathcal{G}_\rho)$$

the second sum in (1.11) is controllable for $\eta \leq \eta_\rho$, where η_ρ depends on ρ only, *no matter* $\mathcal{D}$ is. When $\mathcal{N} = \mathbf{N}$, restrictions on the range of θ arise. Naturally these estimates rely upon $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{N}$. More precisely we show that these sums are almost surely asymptotically comparable to their respective (computable) means

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{E} d_{\theta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n), \quad \sum_{\substack{n \leq N \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \mathbf{E} d_{\eta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n)$$

and give an already sharp (although not optimal) estimate of the approximation rate. In the above case by using (1.16) next (1.17) below, we get

$$M_{\eta, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{D}}(N) := \sum_{\substack{n \leq N \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \mathbf{E} d_{\eta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq N, d < \eta \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ n \in \mathcal{N}, d \in \mathcal{D}}} \frac{1}{d} + \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (1.12)$$

And

$$M_{\theta, \mathcal{D}}(N) := \sum_{n \leq N} \mathbf{E} d_{\theta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq N, d \leq n^\theta \\ d \in \mathcal{D}}} \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} = \sum_{\substack{n \leq N, d < n^\theta \\ d \in \mathcal{D}}} \frac{1}{d} + \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (1.13)$$

Before stating the results we shall first comment more on correlation problem. This is a central question in the paper and section 2 is entirely devoted to its study. The crucial point concerns the obtention of sharp estimates for the correlation function

$$\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) = \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} - \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\}\mathbf{P}\{\delta|B_m\},$$

and also for the probability

$$\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\}.$$

There are two cases of very different nature and unequal difficulty: the weakly dependent case ($n + n^c \leq m$) which is relatively easy to treat, and the dependent case ($n \leq m \leq n + n^c$). Here c is some very small positive real. In the weakly dependent case, there is a constant C depending on c such that for all η sufficiently small and n large enough (see (3.3))

$$\sup_{\substack{d < \eta \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ \delta < \eta \sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}}} |\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m))| \leq \begin{cases} Cn(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/c} & \text{if } n + n^c \leq m \leq 2n, \\ Cn(\frac{\log n}{n})^{1/2c} (\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2} & \text{if } m \geq 2n. \end{cases}$$

The dependent case is the difficult case and the only way we found, after having tried others, to bound efficiently $\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m))$ was, to start with $\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) \leq \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\}$, next to compare $\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\}$ with $\mathbf{P}\{d\delta|B_n B_m\}$, and estimate the probability $\mathbf{P}\{D|B_n B_m\}$. This is, however, not a simple task and involves truly number theoretical arguments. Exponentials of second order arise (in (2.28)) for which we used Sarkösy's estimate (Lemma 2.13). And the multiplicative functions $\rho_k(D) = \#\{1 \leq r \leq D : D|r^2 + kr\}$, $k \leq m - n$, play a central role when n becomes large. As a consequence of a sharper result (Proposition 2.10), we show in section 2 that

$$\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} \leq C(m - n) \frac{2^{\omega(d\delta)}}{d\delta} + C_\varepsilon \frac{(d\delta)^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Although we are convinced that this bound is quite sharp, we are less sure that it fully describes what happens for $\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m))$ in the dependent range $(n, n + n^c)$, and must say that we have no alternative clue at the present time.

We can now state our main results

Theorem 1.1. *Let $0 < \theta < 1/6$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\sum_{n=1}^N d_{\theta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} M_{\theta, \mathcal{D}}(N) + \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(M_{\theta, \mathcal{D}}^{1/2+\varepsilon}(N)).$$

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{N}$ be satisfying the growth condition $(\mathcal{G}_\rho)$ for some $\rho > 0$. Put $M_N = \sum_{\substack{n \leq N \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \log^4 n$. Then there exists η_ρ depending on ρ only, such that for $\eta \leq \eta_\rho$*

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq N \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} d_{\eta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} M_{\eta, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{D}}(N) + \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(M_N^{1/2} \log^{3/2+\varepsilon} M_N).$$

And if $\mathcal{N}$ grows at most polynomially, then for some constant b_0 ,

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq N \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} d_{\eta, \mathcal{D}}(B_n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} M_{\eta, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{D}}(N) + \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(M_{\eta, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{D}}(N)^{1/2} (\log M_{\eta, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{D}}(N))^{b_0+\varepsilon}).$$

From the proof given in section 4 follows that $b_0 > 7/2$ suffices, but this value is certainly far from being optimal. Getting an optimal rate of approximation appears as a certainly difficult and quite challenging question. It is also clear from the proofs of the results, we shall give in

the next sections, that the error term is however improvable under additional conditions on the sequence $\mathcal{D}$. Relevant conditions are for instance of the type

$$(a) \quad \#\{\mathcal{D} \cap [1, N]\} = \mathcal{O}(N^\tau) \quad \text{or} \quad (b) \quad \#\{\mathcal{D} \cap [1, N]\} = \mathcal{O}(\log^\eta N), \quad (\mathcal{C})$$

for some $0 < \tau < 1$ or $\eta > 0$. But this aspect of the problem is not considered in the present study.

For proving these results, our essential task will be to bound efficiently the increments $\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{i \leq n \leq j} H_n \right)^2$, where $H_n = \sum_{d \leq n^\theta, d \in \mathcal{D}} (\mathbf{1}_{\{d|B_n\}} - \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\})$, and it is clear that it suffices to bound Δ instead of its absolute value. Some already existing results on the value distribution of Bernoulli sums will be incorporated into the proofs. We briefly recall them. Consider the elliptic Theta function

$$\Theta(d, m) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbf{Z}} e^{im\pi \frac{\ell}{d} - \frac{m\pi^2 \ell^2}{2d^2}}.$$

In [We3] (Theorem II), the following uniform estimate is established:

$$\sup_{2 \leq d \leq n} \left| \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} - \frac{\Theta(d, n)}{d} \right| = \mathcal{O}((\log n)^{5/2} n^{-3/2}). \quad (1.14)$$

Here and throughout the whole paper, C will denote some absolute constant, which may change of value at each occurrence. It is easily seen that

$$\left| \frac{\Theta(d, n)}{d} - \frac{1}{d} \right| \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C}{d} e^{-\frac{n\pi^2}{2d^2}} & \text{if } d \leq \sqrt{n}, \\ \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} & \text{if } \sqrt{n} \leq d \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Therefore

$$\left| \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} - \frac{1}{d} \right| \leq \begin{cases} C \left((\log n)^{5/2} n^{-3/2} + \frac{1}{d} e^{-\frac{n\pi^2}{2d^2}} \right) & \text{if } d \leq \sqrt{n}, \\ \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} & \text{if } \sqrt{n} \leq d \leq n. \end{cases} \quad (1.15)$$

Further for any $\alpha > 0$

$$\sup_{d < \pi \sqrt{\frac{n}{2\alpha \log n}}} \left| \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} - \frac{1}{d} \right| = \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(n^{-\alpha+\varepsilon}), \quad (\forall \varepsilon > 0). \quad (1.16)$$

and for any $0 < \rho < 1$,

$$\sup_{d < (\pi/\sqrt{2})n^{(1-\rho)/2}} \left| \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} - \frac{1}{d} \right| = \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(e^{-(1-\varepsilon)n^\rho}), \quad (\forall 0 < \varepsilon < 1). \quad (1.17)$$

Estimate (1.17) exhibits a dramatic variation of the uniform speed of convergence of $\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\}$ to its limit $1/d$, when switching from the case $d \leq n^{1/2}$ to the case $d \leq n^\theta$, $\theta < 1/2$. It follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} = 1/d$, and

$$\left| \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} - \frac{1}{d} \right| \leq C \frac{d}{n}, \quad \text{if } 2 \leq d \leq \sqrt{n}. \quad (1.18)$$

In particular

$$\sup_{2 \leq d \leq \sqrt{n}} d\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} \leq C. \quad (1.19)$$

2. Second order theory of $(\mathbf{I}(d|B_n) - \mathbf{P}(d|B_n))_n$

Our starting point is the formula $u\delta_{u|B_n} = \sum_{j=0}^{u-1} e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{u} B_n}$, from which we deduce after integration

$$\mathbf{P}\{u|B_n\} = \frac{1}{u} \sum_{j=0}^{u-1} \mathbf{E} e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{u} B_n} = \frac{1}{u} \sum_{j=0}^{u-1} \left(\frac{e^{2i\pi n \frac{j}{u}} + 1}{2} \right)^n = \frac{1}{u} \sum_{j=0}^{u-1} e^{i\pi n \frac{j}{u}} \cos^n \frac{\pi j}{u}. \quad (2.1)$$

Thereby

$$\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} \mathbf{P}\{\delta|B_m\} = \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \sum_{h=0}^{\delta-1} e^{i\pi(n \frac{j}{d} + m \frac{h}{\delta})} \cos^n \frac{\pi j}{d} \cos^m \frac{\pi h}{\delta}. \quad (2.2)$$

Let $m \geq n$. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \sum_{h=0}^{\delta-1} e^{2i\pi(\frac{j}{d} B_n + \frac{h}{\delta} B_m)} \right\} = \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \sum_{h=0}^{\delta-1} \mathbf{E} e^{2i\pi(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta}) B_n} \mathbf{E} e^{2i\pi \frac{h}{\delta} B_{m-n}} \\ &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \sum_{h=0}^{\delta-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta})n} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) e^{i\pi \frac{h}{\delta}(m-n)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \\ &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \sum_{h=0}^{\delta-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \\ &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{h=1}^{\delta-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{d\delta} \left(\sum_{h=0}^{\delta-1} e^{i\pi \frac{h}{\delta}m} \cos^m \pi \frac{h}{\delta} + \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} e^{i\pi \frac{j}{d}n} \cos^n \pi \frac{j}{d} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{h=1}^{\delta-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \\ &\quad + \frac{\mathbf{P}\{\delta|B_m\}}{d} + \frac{\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\}}{\delta} - \frac{1}{d\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{h=1}^{\delta-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} + \frac{\mathbf{P}\{\delta|B_m\}}{d} + \frac{\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\}}{\delta} - \frac{1}{d\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \sum_{h=0}^{\delta-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \left\{ \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) - \cos^n \frac{\pi j}{d} \cos^n \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{h=1}^{\delta-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \left\{ \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) - \cos^n \frac{\pi j}{d} \cos^n \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Here the summands with $j = 0$ or $h = 0$ do not contribute.

2.1. Reductions via symmetries

We begin with the probability

$$\mathbf{P}\{u|B_n\} = \frac{1}{u} \sum_{\ell=0}^{u-1} e^{i\pi n \frac{\ell}{u}} \cos^n \frac{\pi \ell}{u}.$$

— If u is odd, say $u = 2r + 1$, and $r + 1 \leq \ell \leq 2r$, write $\ell = 2r - \lambda$. Then $0 \leq \lambda \leq r - 1$ and

$$\frac{\ell}{u} = \frac{2r - \lambda}{2r + 1} = 1 - \frac{\lambda + 1}{2r + 1} := 1 - \frac{l}{u} \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq l \leq r.$$

Further

$$e^{i\pi n \frac{\ell}{u}} \cos^n \frac{\pi \ell}{u} = e^{i\pi n - i\pi n \frac{l}{u}} \cos^n \left(\pi - \pi \frac{l}{u} \right) = e^{-i\pi n \frac{l}{u}} \cos^n \pi \frac{l}{u}.$$

Thus

$$\mathbf{P}\{u|B_n\} = \frac{1}{u} \sum_{|\ell| < u/2} e^{i\pi n \frac{\ell}{u}} \cos^n \frac{\pi \ell}{u} = \frac{1}{u} + \frac{2}{u} \sum_{1 \leq \ell < u/2} \cos(\pi n \frac{\ell}{u}) \cos^n \frac{\pi \ell}{u}. \quad (2.5)$$

— If u is even: $u = 2r$, then ℓ varies between 1 and $r - 1$, next between $r + 1$ and $2r - 1$ with a median value $\ell = r$. For this indice, we have $\cos^n \frac{\pi \ell}{u} = \cos^n \frac{\pi r}{2r} = \cos^n \frac{\pi}{2} = 0$, and there is no contribution. If $r + 1 \leq \ell \leq 2r - 1$, write $\ell = 2r - 1 - b$. Then $0 \leq b \leq r - 2$ and

$$\frac{\ell}{u} = \frac{2r - 1 - b}{2r} = 1 - \frac{b + 1}{2r} := 1 - \frac{l}{u} \quad \text{with} \quad 1 \leq l \leq r - 1.$$

Thus $e^{i\pi n \frac{\ell}{u}} \cos^n \frac{\pi \ell}{u} = e^{i\pi n - i\pi n \frac{l}{u}} \cos^n \left(\pi - \pi \frac{l}{u} \right) = e^{-i\pi n \frac{l}{u}} \cos^n \pi \frac{l}{u}$, and here again we have (2.5).

Now, we pass to the probability $\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\}$. Here also we operate reductions allowing to work in the first quadrant only. This is quite similar to the above. By (2.3), $\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} = \Psi + \Phi$, where

$$\Psi = \Psi((d, n), (\delta, m)) = \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{h=1}^{\delta-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\Phi = \Phi((d, n), (\delta, m)) = \frac{\mathbf{P}\{\delta|B_m\}}{d} + \frac{\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\}}{\delta} - \frac{1}{d\delta}.$$

We shall thus be mainly concerned with the sum Ψ .

— If δ is odd, say $\delta = 2q + 1$, and $q + 1 \leq h \leq 2q$, write $h = 2q - b$. Then $0 \leq b \leq q - 1$ and

$$\frac{h}{\delta} = \frac{2q - b}{2q + 1} = 1 - \frac{b + 1}{2q + 1} := 1 - \frac{\beta}{\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq \beta \leq q.$$

The corresponding summand writes

$$\begin{aligned} e^{i\pi m} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n - \frac{\beta}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \left(\pi - \frac{\pi\beta}{\delta} \right) \cos^n \left(\pi + \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{\beta}{\delta} \right) \right) \\ = e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n - \frac{\beta}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \left(\frac{\pi\beta}{\delta} \right) \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{\beta}{\delta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \left\{ \sum_{h=1}^q e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sum_{h=-q}^{-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right).\end{aligned}$$

— If δ is even: $\delta = 2q$, then h varies between 1 and $q-1$, next between $q+1$ and $2q-1$ with a median value $h = q$. In the latter case, we have $\cos^{m-n} \frac{\pi h}{\delta} = \cos^{m-n} \frac{\pi q}{2q} = \cos^{m-n} \frac{\pi}{2} = 0$, and there is no contribution of this indice. If $q+1 \leq h \leq 2q-1$, write $h = 2q-1-b$. Then $0 \leq b \leq q-2$ and

$$\frac{h}{\delta} = \frac{2q-1-b}{2q} = 1 - \frac{b+1}{2q} := 1 - \frac{\beta}{\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq \beta \leq q-1.$$

The corresponding summand writes exactly as before:

$$e^{i\pi m} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n - \frac{\beta}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \left(\pi - \frac{\pi\beta}{\delta} \right) \cos^n \left(\pi + \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{\beta}{\delta} \right) \right)$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \left\{ \sum_{h=1}^{q-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{h=-(q-1)}^{-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right).\end{aligned}$$

A similar remark can be made concerning the subsum $\sum_{j=1}^{d-1}$. We display this point again to make the proof transparent.

— If d is odd: $d = 2p+1$, and j is between $p+1$ and $2p$, write $j = 2p-b$, $0 \leq b \leq p-1$. Then

$$\frac{j}{d} = \frac{2p-b}{2p+1} = 1 - \frac{b+1}{2p+1} := 1 - \frac{\beta}{d} \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq \beta \leq p.$$

The corresponding summand writes

$$e^{i\pi n} e^{i\pi(-\frac{\beta n}{d} + \frac{h m}{\delta})} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \left(\pi + \pi \left(-\frac{\beta}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) \right) = e^{i\pi(-\frac{\beta n}{d} + \frac{h m}{\delta})} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(-\frac{\beta}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right).$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^p e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^p e^{i\pi(-\frac{j n}{d} + \frac{h m}{\delta})} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(-\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} \sum_{1 \leq |j| < d/2} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right).\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

— If d is even: $d = 2p$, we distinguish between $1 \leq j \leq p-1$, $p+1 \leq j \leq 2p-1$ and the median value $j = p$, which this time contributes to the sum. When $p+1 \leq j \leq 2p-1$, write $j = 2p-b-1$, $0 \leq b \leq p-2$. Then

$$\frac{j}{d} = \frac{2p-b-1}{2p} = 1 - \frac{b+1}{2p} := 1 - \frac{\beta}{d} \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq \beta \leq p-1.$$

Thus the corresponding summand writes exactly as in the previous case

$$e^{i\pi(-\frac{\beta n}{d} + \frac{hm}{\delta})} \cos^{m-n} \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi(-\frac{\beta}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta}),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} e^{i\pi(-\frac{jn}{d} + \frac{hm}{\delta})} \cos^{m-n} \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi(-\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta}) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} \sum_{1 \leq |j| < d/2} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} e^{i\pi(\frac{n}{2} + \frac{hm}{\delta})} \cos^{m-n} \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \cdot \cos^n \left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We therefore get

$$\Psi = \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} \sum_{1 \leq |j| < d/2} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta}) + \mathbf{r}, \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$\mathbf{r} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } d \text{ is odd} \\ \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} e^{i\pi(\frac{n}{2} + \frac{hm}{\delta})} \cos^{m-n} \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \cdot \cos^n \left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right) & \text{if } d \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (2.8a)$$

Finally as $\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} = \Psi + \Phi$, we obtained

First reduced form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} \sum_{1 \leq |j| < d/2} \cos\left(\frac{\pi j}{d}n + \frac{\pi h}{\delta}m\right) \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi\left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{r} + \frac{\mathbf{P}\{\delta|B_m\}}{d} + \frac{\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\}}{\delta} - \frac{1}{d\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Consequently we have to estimate four sums of type

$$\Psi_{\varepsilon, \eta} = \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j < d/2 \\ 1 \leq h < \delta/2}} e^{i\pi(\eta \frac{j}{d}n + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi\left(\eta \frac{j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta}\right), \quad (2.10)$$

where $\varepsilon, \eta \in \{-1, +1\}$. Turning to Δ we observe that

$$\Delta = \Psi - \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{h=1}^{\delta-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^m \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \frac{\pi j}{d} = \Psi - (\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} - \frac{1}{d})(\mathbf{P}\{\delta|B_m\} - \frac{1}{\delta}). \quad (2.11)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} - \frac{1}{d})(\mathbf{P}\{\delta|B_m\} - \frac{1}{\delta}) &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{h=1}^{\delta-1} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^m \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \frac{\pi j}{d} \\ &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2 \\ 1 \leq |j| < d/2}} e^{i\pi(n\frac{j}{d} + m\frac{h}{\delta})} \cos^n \frac{\pi j}{d} \cos^m \frac{\pi h}{\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

we get

Second reduced form:

$$\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) = \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2 \\ 1 \leq |j| < d/2}} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \left\{ \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) - \cos^n \frac{\pi j}{d} \cos^n \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right\} + \mathbf{r}. \quad (2.12)$$

2.2. The weakly dependent case ($\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{n}^c$)

In what follows $c \in]0, 1[$ is some fixed small real. We are indeed interested in results valid for c arbitrary small. By (2.11) we know that

$$\Delta = \Psi - (\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} - \frac{1}{d})(\mathbf{P}\{\delta|B_m\} - \frac{1}{\delta}),$$

where the sum $\Psi = \Psi((d, n), (\delta, m))$ is defined in (2.6). Fix also some reals α, α' , depending on c , such that $\alpha > \alpha' > \max(3/2, 1/c)$. We shall consider two subcases.

Case: $\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{n}^c \leq \mathbf{m} \leq 2\mathbf{n}$.

We shall first establish the following

Proposition 2.1. *There exist constants C and n_0 depending on c , such that for $n \geq n_0$ and $n + n^c \leq m \leq 2n$*

$$|\Psi((d, n), (\delta, m))| \leq C \left\{ n \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/c} + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2 \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2}}} e^{-3n(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta})^2} \right\}.$$

In particular, if $\max(d, \delta) < \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{2\alpha}} \left(\frac{m-n}{\log(m-n)} \right)^{1/2}$, we have the simpler bound

$$|\Psi((d, n), (\delta, m))| \leq C n \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/c}.$$

The second assertion simply follows from the fact that the sum in the righthand side disappears. The proof of the above proposition will result from three lemmas. By (2.10), the sum $\Psi = \Psi((d, n), (\delta, m))$ is a sum of four subsums, which are all of the type

$$\Psi_{\varepsilon, \eta} = \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j < d/2 \\ 1 \leq h < \delta/2}} e^{i\pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} n + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta} m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi (\eta \frac{j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta}),$$

where $\varepsilon, \eta \in \{-1, +1\}$. We shall therefore estimate the sums $\Psi_{\varepsilon, \eta}$ which, in what follows we will simply write Ψ , when no confusion.

Put for any integer $v \geq 1$

$$\varphi_v = \left(\frac{2\alpha \log v}{v} \right)^{1/2}, \quad \tau_v = \frac{\sin \varphi_v/2}{\varphi_v/2}. \quad (2.13)$$

Let n_0 be sufficiently large so that for $m - n \geq n_0$,

$$\tau_{m-n} \geq (\alpha'/\alpha)^{1/2}. \quad (2.14)$$

We distinguish between three cases:

- (I) $\left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \pi/2$.
- (II) $0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2}$ and $0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2 \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2}$.
- (III) $0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2}$ and $2 \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq \pi/2$.

Case I. Put

$$\Psi_1 := \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq j < \frac{d}{2}} \sum_{\left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \pi/2} e^{i\pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} n + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta} m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{\eta j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta} \right).$$

Lemma 2.2. *There exist constants C and n_0 depending on c such that for m, n such that $m - n \geq n_0$,*

$$|\Psi_1| \leq (m - n)^{-\alpha'}.$$

Proof. As $|\cos \frac{\pi h}{\delta}| \leq \cos \varphi_{m-n}$, we get since $\log u \leq u - 1$, $u > 0$: for $m - n$ large enough, say $m - n \geq n_0$ (so that $2 \sin^2(\varphi_{m-n}/2) < 1$)

$$|\cos \frac{\pi h}{\delta}|^{m-n} \leq \cos^{m-n} \varphi_{m-n} = e^{(m-n) \log(1 - 2 \sin^2(\varphi_{m-n}/2))} \leq e^{-2(m-n) \sin^2(\varphi_{m-n}/2)}.$$

But

$$2(m - n) \sin^2(\varphi_{m-n}/2) = 2(m - n)(\varphi_{m-n}/2)^2 \tau_{m-n}^2 \geq \frac{\alpha'(m - n) \log m - n}{m - n} = \alpha' \log m - n.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_1| &\leq \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq j < \frac{d}{2}} \sum_{\left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \pi/2} |\cos \pi \frac{h}{\delta}|^{m-n} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{\left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \pi/2} \cos^{m-n} \varphi_{m-n} \\ &\leq \cos^{m-n} \varphi_{m-n} \leq (m - n)^{-\alpha'}. \end{aligned}$$

■

Case II. Let

$$\Psi_2 = \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}} \sum_{0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}} e^{i\pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} n + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta} m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta}).$$

We shall prove

Lemma 2.3. *There exist constants C and n_0 depending on c only such that for $\min(m-n, n) \geq n_0$*

$$|\Psi_2| \leq C(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/c} + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{-3n(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta})^2}.$$

The estimate only makes sense if $m > n + n^c$.

Proof. Using Mac-Laurin formula, for any positive integer p there exists a polynomial $Q_p(x) = \sum_{s=1}^{p-1} a_s x^{2s}$, with $a_1 = -1/2$, $a_2 = -1/12, \dots$ and constants x_p, C_p depending on p only, such that for $|x| \leq x_p$,

$$|\log \cos x - Q_p(x)| \leq C_p |x|^{2p},$$

and

$$|Q_p(x) + x^2/2| \leq C_p |x|^4.$$

Hence, for $|x| \leq x_p$,

$$Q_p(x) \leq -x^2/3,$$

provided that x_p is sufficiently small, which we do assume from now on. We select a integer p so that

$$c > \frac{1}{p+1}. \quad (2.15)$$

Put $E(x) = e^{Q_p(x)}$. We shall compare the subsum Ψ_2 with

$$\Psi'_2 = \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}} \sum_{0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}} e^{i\pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} n + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta} m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} E^n(\pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta})).$$

By using the elementary inequality: $|e^u - e^v| \leq |u - v|$ for $u, v \leq 0$, we observe that

$$|\cos^n x - e^{nQ_p(x)}| \leq n |\log \cos x - Q_p(x)| \leq C_p n |x|^{2p},$$

for $|x| \leq x_p$. We have $\pi|\frac{\eta j}{d} + \frac{\varepsilon h}{\delta}| \leq x_p$ once $m - n$ is large enough. Thus

$$\left| \cos^n \pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta}) - E^n(\pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta})) \right| \leq C_p n \left[\left(\frac{h}{\delta}\right)^{2p} + \left(\frac{j}{d}\right)^{2p} \right].$$

And so

$$\left| \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{i\pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} n + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta} m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \left\{ \cos^n \pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta}) - E^n(\pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta})) \right\} \right|$$

$$\leq C \frac{n}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} [(\frac{h}{\delta})^{2p} + (\frac{j}{d})^{2p}].$$

Therefore

$$|\Psi_2 - \Psi'_2| \leq Cn \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{p+1}. \quad (2.16)$$

Further since $E(x) \leq e^{-x^2/3}$ for $|x| \leq x_p$, we may also simply bound $|\Psi'_2|$ for n large enough as follows

$$|\Psi'_2| \leq \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{-3n(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta})^2}. \quad (2.17)$$

It is clear that these sums are bounded by

$$\frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{-3n(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta})^2} \quad (2.18)$$

With estimates (2.16), (2.17) and (2.18), we therefore get

$$|\Psi_2| \leq C \left\{ n \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{p+1} + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{-3n(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta})^2} \right\}.$$

With p chosen accordingly with (2.15), we have $\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n}^{p+1} \leq \frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n}^{1/c}$; so that if n is sufficiently large, say $n \geq n_0$ where n_0 depends on c, α and $m \geq n + n^c$, we get

$$|\Psi_2| \leq C \left\{ n \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/c} + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{-3n(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta})^2} \right\}.$$

This establishes the lemma. ■

Case III. Let

$$\Psi_3 := \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{2(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq \pi/2 \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{i\pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} n + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta} m)} \cos^{m-n} \varepsilon \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(\eta \frac{j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta} \right).$$

Lemma 2.4. *There exists constants C and n_0 depending on c such that for $n \geq n_0$ and $n + n_0 \leq m \leq 2n$*

$$|\Psi_3| \leq C \frac{1}{(m-n)^{\alpha'}} \left(\frac{\log m - n}{m-n} \right)^{1/2}.$$

It is in this part that it is necessary to introduce the restriction $m \leq 2n$.

Proof. Here we have

$$\left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2} \leq \pi\left(\frac{j}{d} \pm \frac{h}{\delta}\right) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} + \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}.$$

Thus, as soon as $m-n$ is large enough, which is realized if n_0 is large enough, we have (as in case I) the bound $|\cos \pi(\frac{j}{d} \pm \frac{h}{\delta})| \leq \cos \varphi_{m-n}$. And we get $|\cos \pi(\frac{j}{d} \pm \frac{h}{\delta})|^n \leq \cos^n \varphi_{m-n} \leq e^{-2n \sin^2(\varphi_{m-n}/2)}$. But since $m \leq 2n$ we have $n \geq m-n$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} 2n \sin^2(\varphi_{m-n}/2) &= \left(\frac{n}{m-n}\right) 2(m-n) \sin^2(\varphi_{m-n}/2) \geq 2(m-n) \sin^2(\varphi_{m-n}/2) \\ &= 2(m-n)(\varphi_{m-n}/2)^2 \tau_{m-n}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha'(m-n) \log m-n}{m-n} = \alpha' \log m-n. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\cos^n \varphi_{m-n} \leq (m-n)^{-\alpha'}$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{2(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq \pi/2 \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} |\cos \pi(\frac{j}{d} \pm \frac{h}{\delta})|^n &\leq \frac{1}{d\delta(m-n)^{\alpha'}} \sum_{\substack{2(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq \pi/2 \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} 1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\delta(m-n)^{\alpha'}} \sum_{0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}} 1 \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{(m-n)^{\alpha'}} \left(\frac{\log m-n}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. ■

Now we estimate $\mathbf{r}$ defined in (2.8a), when d is even. We have

$$|\mathbf{r}| \leq \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} \left| \cos^{m-n} \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right| \cdot \left| \sin^n \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right|$$

— If $\left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \pi/2$, then

$$|\mathbf{r}| \leq \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} \left| \cos^{m-n} \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right| \leq d^{-1} (m-n)^{-\alpha'}$$

— If $0 \leq \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}$, then

$$|\mathbf{r}| \leq \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2} \left| \sin^n \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right| \leq d^{-1} \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{n/2}.$$

So that, for n large enough

$$|\mathbf{r}| \leq d^{-1} (m-n)^{-\alpha'}. \quad (2.19)$$

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Combining Lemmas 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4, finally gives in view of (2.8), estimate (1.3), and that $\alpha > \alpha' > \max(3/2, 1/c)$: there exist constants C and n_0 such that for

$n \geq n_0$, and $n + n^c \leq m \leq 2n$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Psi((d, n), (\delta, m))| &\leq C \left\{ \frac{1}{(m-n)^{\alpha'}} + n \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/c} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2 \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2}}} e^{-3n \left(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta} \right)^2} + \frac{1}{(m-n)^{\alpha'}} \left(\frac{\log m - n}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \right\} \\
&\leq C \left\{ n \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/c} + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2 \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2}}} e^{-3n \left(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta} \right)^2} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

■

Remarks. — The condition $m \geq n + n^c$ is in turn only used to make the bound in Lemma 2.3 efficient.

— By construction, we have the trivial bound $|\Psi_2| \leq C \frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n}$. Combining it with Lemmas 2.2 and 2.4, we get another estimate: $|\Psi| \leq C \frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n}$ which is valid as soon as $m - n \geq n_0$, $m \leq 2n$, n_0 sufficiently large.

Turning to estimates involving the correlation Δ , we notice that $m \leq 2n$ implies $m - n \leq n$ and so

$$\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{2\alpha}} \left(\frac{m-n}{\log(m-n)} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{1/2}.$$

If $\max(d, \delta) < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{1/2}$ then by (1.16)

$$|\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} - \frac{1}{d}| |\mathbf{P}\{\delta|B_n\} - \frac{1}{\delta}| \leq C n^{-2\alpha'}.$$

Combining this with Proposition 2.1, shows in view of (2.11)

Proposition 2.5. *There exist constants n_0 and C such that for any $n \geq n_0$ and $n + n^c \leq m \leq 2n$*

$$\sup_{(d \vee \delta) < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{1/2}} |\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m))| \leq C n \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/c}.$$

Case: $m \geq 2n$.

To treat this case, we have to proceed to little changes, but the method is very similar. We will establish the following

Proposition 2.6. *There exist constants C and n_0 depending on c such that for $n \geq n_0$, and $m \geq 2n$*

$$|\Psi((d, n), (\delta, m))| \leq C \left\{ n \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/2c} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n} \right)^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2}}} e^{-3n \left(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta} \right)^2} \right\}.$$

Let $\delta_0 > \sqrt{2}$, then for all n large and $m \geq 2n$

$$\sup_{\substack{d < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ \delta < \frac{\pi}{\delta_0 \sqrt{2\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}}}} |\Psi((d, n), (\delta, m))| \leq Cn \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2c} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}$$

Before giving the proof, observe by the choice of α, α' that $\alpha > \alpha' > \max(3/2, (1/2c) - 1)$. Next let n_0 be sufficiently large so that for $n \geq n_0$,

$$\min(\tau_n, \tau_{m-n}) \geq (\alpha'/\alpha)^{1/2}. \quad (2.20)$$

We distinguish again between three cases:

- (I) $\left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \pi/2$.
- (II) $0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}$ and $0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2\left(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}$.
- (III) $0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}$ and $2\left(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n}\right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq \pi/2$.

Case I. The sum

$$\Psi_1 := \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{1 \leq j < \frac{d}{2}} \sum_{\left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \pi/2} e^{i\pi\left(\frac{\eta j}{d}n + \frac{\varepsilon h}{\delta}m\right)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{\eta j}{d} + \frac{\varepsilon h}{\delta}\right),$$

has been already estimated in Lemma 2.2 and we recall that we have $|\Psi_1| \leq (m-n)^{-\alpha'}$.

Case II. Let

$$\Psi_2 := \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2\left(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}} \sum_{0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}} e^{i\pi\left(\eta \frac{j}{d}n + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta}m\right)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi \left(\eta \frac{j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta}\right).$$

We will establish

Lemma 2.7. *There exist constants C and n_0 depending on c , such that for $n \geq n_0$ and $m \geq 2n$*

$$|\Psi_2| \leq C \left(n \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2c} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2\left(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n}\right)^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}}} e^{-3n\left(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta}\right)^2} \right).$$

Proof. We proceed as before except that we select p so that $c > \frac{1}{2p+1}$, and will compare the sum Ψ_2 with the sum

$$\Psi'_2 := \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2\left(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}} \sum_{0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}} e^{i\pi\left(\eta \frac{j}{d}n + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta}m\right)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} E^n \left(\pi \left(\frac{\eta j}{d} + \frac{\varepsilon h}{\delta} \right) \right). \quad (2.21)$$

Again we observe that $|\cos^n x - e^{nQ_p(x)}| \leq n |\log \cos x - Q_p(x)| \leq C_p n |x|^{2p}$, for $|x| \leq x_p$, and that for n large enough we have $\pi \left| \frac{\eta j}{d} + \frac{\varepsilon h}{\delta} \right| \leq x_p$. Thus

$$\left| \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{\eta j}{d} + \frac{\varepsilon h}{\delta} \right) - E^n \left(\pi \left(\frac{\eta j}{d} + \frac{\varepsilon h}{\delta} \right) \right) \right| \leq C_p n \left[\left(\frac{h}{\delta} \right)^{2p} + \left(\frac{j}{d} \right)^{2p} \right].$$

And so

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{i\pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} n + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta} m)} \cos^{m-n} \varepsilon \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \left\{ \cos^n \pi \left(\eta \frac{j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta} \right) - E^n \left(\pi \left(\frac{\eta j}{d} + \frac{\varepsilon h}{\delta} \right) \right) \right\} \right| \\ & \leq C \frac{n}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} \left[\left(\frac{h}{\delta} \right)^{2p} + \left(\frac{j}{d} \right)^{2p} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$|\Psi_2 - \Psi'_2| \leq Cn \max \left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{(p+1/2)}, \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{(p+1/2)} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \right). \quad (2.22)$$

As we have

$$\left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{(p+1/2)} \geq \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{(p+1/2)} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \Leftrightarrow m-n \leq n. \quad (2.23)$$

Indeed, the inequality on the left is equivalently rewritten as $(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n})^p \geq (\frac{\log n}{n})^p$. Further, since $E(x) \leq e^{-x^2/3}$ for $|x| \leq x_p$, we may again simply bound $|\Psi'_2|$ as follows: for n large enough

$$|\Psi'_2| \leq \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{-3n(\frac{\eta j}{d} + \frac{\varepsilon h}{\delta})^2}. \quad (2.24)$$

It is clear that the sum appearing in the righthand side is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{-3n(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta})^2} \quad (2.25)$$

With estimates (2.22), (2.23), (2.24) and (2.25), we therefore get if $m \geq 2n$

$$|\Psi_2| \leq C \left(n \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{(p+1/2)} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{-3n(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta})^2} \right).$$

As $c > \frac{1}{2p+1}$, it follows that

$$|\Psi_2| \leq C \left(n \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/2c} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq 2(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{-3n(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta})^2} \right).$$

This establishes the lemma. ■

Case III. Let

$$\Psi_3 := \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{2(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n})^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq \pi/2, 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}} e^{i\pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} n + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta} m)} \cos^{m-n} \varepsilon \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \cos^n \pi(\eta \frac{j}{d} + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\delta}).$$

Lemma 2.8.

$$|\Psi_3| \leq \frac{1}{n^{\alpha'}} \left(\frac{\log m - n}{m - n} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Here we have since $m - n \geq n$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\pi}{2} + \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} &\geq \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} \pm \frac{h}{\delta} \right) \\ &\geq 2 \left(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n} \right)^{1/2} - \left(\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \geq \left(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, as soon as n is large enough, we have the bound $|\cos \pi(\frac{j}{d} \pm \frac{h}{\delta})| \leq \cos \varphi_n$. And we get $|\cos \pi(\frac{j}{d} \pm \frac{h}{\delta})|^n \leq \cos^n \varphi_n = e^{-2n \sin^2(\varphi_n/2)}$. But

$$2n \sin^2(\varphi_n/2) \geq 2n \sin^2(\varphi_n/2) = 2n(\varphi_n/2)^2 \tau_n^2 \geq \frac{\alpha' n \log n}{n} = \alpha' \log n.$$

Therefore $\cos^n \varphi_n \leq n^{-\alpha'}$, and so have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{2(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n})^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq \pi/2 \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} |\cos \pi(\frac{j}{d} \pm \frac{h}{\delta})|^n &\leq \frac{1}{d\delta n^{\alpha'}} \sum_{\substack{2(\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n})^{1/2} \leq \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq \pi/2 \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} 1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\delta n^{\alpha'}} \sum_{0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}} 1 \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{n^{\alpha'}} \left(\frac{\log m - n}{m - n} \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. ■

Finally $\mathbf{r}$ is estimated in exactly the same way in this case too, and we have that estimate (2.19) holds again.

Proof of Proposition 2.6. Combining the previous estimates finally show in view of (2.8), estimate (1.3) and since $\alpha > \alpha' > \max(3/2, (1/c) - 1)$: there exist constants C and n_0 such that for $n \geq n_0$, and $m \geq 2n$

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi((d, n), (\delta, m))| &\leq C \left\{ \frac{1}{(m-n)^{\alpha'}} + n \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/2c} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{-3n(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta})^2} + \frac{1}{n^{\alpha'}} \left(\frac{\log m - n}{m - n} \right)^{1/2} \right\} \\ &\leq C \left\{ n \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/2c} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{0 < \frac{\pi j}{d} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log n}{n})^{1/2} \\ 0 < \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \leq (\frac{2\alpha \log(m-n)}{m-n})^{1/2}}} e^{-3n(\frac{j}{d} - \frac{h}{\delta})^2} \right\}. \quad (2.26) \end{aligned}$$

And produces the wished inequality. Now if $d < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right)^{1/2}$, $\delta < \frac{\pi}{\delta_0 \sqrt{2\alpha}} \left(\frac{m}{\log m}\right)^{1/2}$, as $m \leq 2(m-n)$ we have

$$\delta < \frac{\pi}{\delta_0 \sqrt{2\alpha}} \left(\frac{2(m-n)}{\log 2(m-n)}\right)^{1/2} < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \left(\frac{(m-n)}{\log(m-n)}\right)^{1/2},$$

if $\delta_0 > \sqrt{2}$. In which case, the exponential sum appearing in the righthand side of (2.26) no longer contributes. Hence

$$\sup_{\substack{d < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ \delta < \frac{\pi}{\delta_0 \sqrt{2\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}}}} |\Psi((d, n), (\delta, m))| \leq Cn \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2c} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}. \quad (2.27)$$

■

Remark. — We have the trivial bound $|\Psi_2| \leq C \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}$. By combining with Lemmas 2.6 and 2.8 we also get: $|\Psi| \leq \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}$, which is valid for $m \geq 2n \geq n_0$, n_0 sufficiently large.

Turning to estimates involving the correlation Δ , we have in view of (1.16)

$$|\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} - \frac{1}{d}| |\mathbf{P}\{\delta|B_m\} - \frac{1}{\delta}| \leq Cn^{-\alpha'} m^{-\alpha'}.$$

With (2.26) this now implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\substack{d < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ \delta < \frac{\pi}{\delta_0 \sqrt{2\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}}}} |\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m))| &\leq Cn \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2c} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2} + \frac{C}{(nm)^{\alpha'}} \\ &\leq Cn \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2c} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.9. *There exist two constants C and n_0 depending on c , such that for any $n \geq n_0$ and $m \geq 2n$*

$$\sup_{\substack{d < \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ \delta < \frac{\pi}{\delta_0 \sqrt{2\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}}}} |\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m))| \leq Cn \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2c} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n}\right)^{1/2}.$$

2.3. The strongly dependent case

The main object of this section will consist of establishing the following delicate estimate.

Proposition 2.10. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant C_ε depending on ε only, such that*

$$\left| \mathbf{P}\{D|B_n B_m\} - \frac{1}{D 2^{m-n}} \sum_{k=0}^{m-n} C_{m-n}^k \rho_k(D) \right| \leq C_\varepsilon \left(\frac{D^{1+\varepsilon}}{n} \right)^{1/2},$$

where

$$\rho_k(D) = \begin{cases} \prod_{p|D} p^{\lfloor \frac{v_p(D)}{2} \rfloor} & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \prod_{v_p(k) < v_p(D)/2} (2p^{v_p(k)}) \cdot \prod_{v_p(k) \geq v_p(D)/2} p^{\lfloor \frac{v_p(D)}{2} \rfloor} & \text{if } k \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Further, for any positive integers n, m and D ,

$$\mathbf{P}\{D|B_n B_m\} \leq \frac{1}{2^{m-n}\sqrt{D}} + \frac{2^{\omega(D)}(m-n)}{D} + C_\varepsilon \frac{D^{1/2+\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

And for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant C_ε depending on ε only, such that

$$\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} \leq C(m-n) \frac{2^{\omega(d\delta)}}{d\delta} + C_\varepsilon \frac{(d\delta)^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

The proof of Proposition 2.10 is based on several intermediate results. We begin with computing the characteristic function of $B_n B_m$. Plainly, writing that $B_n B_m = B_n^2 + B_n(B_m - B_n)$ and using independence

$$\mathbf{E} e^{iv B_n B_m} = \frac{1}{2^n 2^{m-n}} \sum_{k=0}^{m-n} C_{m-n}^k \sum_{h=0}^n C_n^h e^{iv(h^2 + kh)}.$$

And so

$$\mathbf{P}\{D|B_n B_m\} = \mathbf{E} \left(\frac{1}{D} \sum_{j=0}^{D-1} e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D} B_n B_m} \right) = \frac{1}{2^n 2^{m-n}} \sum_{k=0}^{m-n} C_{m-n}^k \frac{1}{D} \sum_{j=0}^{D-1} \sum_{h=0}^n C_n^h e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D} (h^2 + kh)}. \quad (2.28)$$

We preliminarily evaluate the $(\mathbf{C}, 1)$ sums

$$S_L := \frac{1}{L} \sum_{h=0}^L e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D} (h^2 + kh)},$$

and will next compare S_n to the Euler $(\mathbf{E}, 1)$ sum $\sum_{h=0}^n 2^{-n} C_n^h e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D} (h^2 + kh)}$. We write $L = ND + m$ with $N \geq 0$ and $0 \leq m < D$. Then

$$S_L = \frac{1}{L} \left(\sum_{X=0}^{N-1} \sum_{x=XD+1}^{(X+1)D} + \sum_{x=ND+1}^{ND+m} \right) e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D} (x^2 + kx)}$$

As

$$\sum_{x=XD+1}^{(X+1)D} e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D} (x^2 + kx)} = \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D} (y^2 + ky)},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{N}{L} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D} (y^2 + ky)} + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{y=1}^m e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D} (y^2 + ky)} \\ &= N \left(\frac{1}{L} - \frac{1}{ND} \right) \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D} (y^2 + ky)} + \frac{1}{D} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D} (y^2 + ky)} + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{y=1}^m e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D} (y^2 + ky)} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for $j = 1, \dots, D$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| S_L - \frac{1}{D} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} \right| &\leq \left(\frac{|ND-L|}{LD} \right) \left| \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} \right| + \frac{1}{L} \left| \sum_{y=1}^m e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{L} \left(\left| \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} \right| + \left| \sum_{y=1}^m e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} \right| \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

Note that if $t = (j, D) > 1$, estimate (2.29) can be improved by using the same arguments. Let $j = tj'$, $D = tD'$. Then $\frac{1}{D} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} = \frac{1}{D'} \sum_{y=1}^{D'} e^{2i\pi \frac{j'}{D'}(y^2+ky)}$, and writing L under the form $L = N'D' + m'$ with $0 \leq m' < D'$, we get similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \left| S_L - \frac{1}{D} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} \right| &\leq \frac{1}{L} \left(\left| \sum_{y=1}^{D'} e^{2i\pi \frac{j'}{D'}(y^2+ky)} \right| + \left| \sum_{y=1}^m e^{2i\pi \frac{j'}{D'}(y^2+ky)} \right| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{L} \max_{m'=1}^{D'} \left| \sum_{y=1}^{m'} e^{2i\pi \frac{j'}{D'}(y^2+ky)} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

When $L = n$, this shows that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{h=0}^n e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(h^2+kh)} = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right). \quad (2.31)$$

Although (E,1) does not includes (C,1) (see [H] Chap.8) in general, the latter estimate will imply this, thanks to the result below.

Lemma 2.11. ([H] Theorem 149, p.213) *Let $A = \{A_n, n \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of reals such that*

$$C_n^1(A) = \frac{A_1 + \dots + A_n}{n} = a + o(n^{-1/2}).$$

Then A is summable (E, q) for any positive q .

The conclusion of the lemma is wrong when replacing o by $\mathcal{O}$ (see also [H]).

Let

$$\rho_k(D) = \#\{1 \leq y \leq D : D|y^2 + ky\}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, m-n.$$

Corollary 2.12. *We have for each k*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{D} \sum_{j=0}^{D-1} \sum_{h=0}^n 2^{-n} C_n^h e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(h^2+kh)} = \frac{\rho_k(D)}{D}.$$

Proof. In view of (2.29), the assumption of lemma 2.15 is fulfilled. Thus, by considering separately imaginary and real parts, the lemma applied with $q = 1$ implies for $j = 1, \dots, D$ that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{h=0}^n 2^{-n} C_n^h e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(h^2+kh)} = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)}.$$

Henceforth

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{D} \sum_{j=0}^{D-1} \sum_{h=0}^n 2^{-n} C_n^h e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(h^2+kh)} = \frac{1}{D^2} \sum_{j=0}^{D-1} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)}.$$

It remains to observe that

$$\frac{1}{D^2} \sum_{j=0}^{D-1} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} = \frac{\#\{1 \leq y \leq D : D|y^2+ky\}}{D} = \frac{\rho_k(D)}{D}. \quad (2.32)$$

■

We shall now give a uniform estimate of the speed of convergence in the above limit. For, we use the simple bound of the difference between the sum (E,1) by the Euler method and the sum (C,1) by the Césaro method. By linearity, it is enough to get a bound for the sum (E,1) alone. Let $\{a_k, k \geq 0\}$ be an arbitrary sequence of reals and put $A_\ell = \sum_{k=0}^\ell a_k$, $\ell \geq 0$.

Then there exists an absolute constant C such that for every positive integer n

$$\left| \sum_{h=0}^n 2^{-n} C_n^h a_h \right| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{\ell=0}^n |A_\ell|, \quad (2.33)$$

This is easily seen by using Abel summation: put

$$E_n = \sum_{h=0}^n 2^{-n} C_n^h a_h = \sum_{h=0}^n v_h a_h,$$

where $v_h = v_h(n) = 2^{-n} C_n^h$, $h = 0, \dots, n$. According to Theorem 138(1) p.201 in [H] (see also p. 214), the supremum is reached at the value

$$\nu = \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \right\rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad v_\nu \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (2.34)$$

where C is an absolute constant. If $\frac{n+1}{2}$ is integer, then $v_{\nu-1}$ and v_ν are equal. Besides, v_k decreases on either side of $k = \nu$. Splitting the sum E_n into the two subsums $E_n^1 = \sum_{k=0}^\nu v_k a_k$, $E_n^2 = \sum_{k=\nu+1}^n v_k a_k$, and since $a_\ell = A_\ell - A_{\ell-1}$, $a_0 = A_0$, we get in the one hand

$$E_n^1 = v_0 a_0 + \sum_{k=1}^\nu v_k (A_k - A_{k-1}) = -\{A_0(v_1 - v_0) + A_1(v_2 - v_1) + \dots + A_{\nu-1}(v_\nu - v_{\nu-1})\} + v_\nu A_\nu.$$

Thus

$$|E_n^1| \leq v_\nu |A_\nu| + \max_{m=0}^{\nu-1} |A_m| \sum_{m=1}^\nu (v_m - v_{m-1}) \leq 2v_\nu \max_{m=0}^\nu |A_m|.$$

And in the other

$$E_n^2 = \sum_{k=\nu+1}^n v_k (A_k - A_{k-1}) = -v_{\nu+1} A_\nu + A_{\nu+1}(v_{\nu+1} - v_{\nu+2}) + \dots + A_{n-1}(v_{n-1} - v_n) + v_n A_n.$$

Hence

$$|E_n^2| \leq \max_{m=\nu}^n |A_m| \{v_{\nu+1} + \sum_{m=\nu+1}^{n-1} (v_m - v_{m+1}) + v_n\} \leq 2v_{\nu+1} \max_{m=\nu}^n |A_m|.$$

We have thus established (2.33).

Now let $0 \leq j \leq D-1$. Let also $0 \leq k \leq m-n$. We apply (2.33) with the choice

$$a_h = e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(h^2+kh)} - \frac{1}{D} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)}, \quad 0 \leq h \leq n.$$

If $j = 0$, then $a_h \equiv 0$ and there is nothing to prove. If $0 < j \leq D-1$, we find in view of (2.30) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{h=0}^n 2^{-n} C_n^h \left(e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(h^2+kh)} - \frac{1}{D} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} \right) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{h=0}^n 2^{-n} C_n^h e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(h^2+kh)} - \frac{1}{D} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{\ell=0}^n \left| \sum_{h=0}^{\ell} \left(e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(h^2+kh)} - \frac{1}{D} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} \right) \right| \\ &= \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{\ell=0}^n \left| \sum_{h=0}^{\ell} e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(h^2+kh)} - \frac{\ell}{D} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2+ky)} \right| \leq 2 \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{m'=1}^{D'} \left| \sum_{y=1}^{m'} e^{2i\pi \frac{j'}{D'}(y^2+ky)} \right|, \end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

where C is the same absolute constant as in (2.33) and the used notation arises from (2.30): if $t = (j, D) > 1$, then $j = tj'$, $D = tD'$, $n = N'D' + m'$ with $1 \leq m' \leq D'$.

Now we need the following lemma:

Lemma 2.13. *Let α be a real number and a, q be positive integers such that $(a, q) = 1$ and $|\alpha - a/q| < 1/q^2$. Then, for any positive integer M*

$$\left| \sum_{x=1}^M e^{2i\pi\alpha x^2} \right|^2 \leq \sum_{u=1-M}^{M-1} \left| \sum_{y=\max(1-u, 1)}^{\min(M, M-u)} e^{4i\pi\alpha uy} \right| \leq 49 \left\{ \frac{M^2}{q} + (M \log q) + q \log q \right\}.$$

This follows from Lemma 4 p.128 in [S] and its proof. The last inequality is precisely what is established in the proof. If $T = \sum_{x=1}^M e^{2i\pi\alpha(x^2+kx)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T^2 &= \sum_{x=1}^M \sum_{y=1}^M e^{2i\pi\alpha(x^2-y^2+k(x-y))} = \sum_{y=1}^M \sum_{x=1}^M e^{2i\pi\alpha(x-y)(x+y+k)} = \sum_{y=1}^M \sum_{u=1-y}^{M-y} e^{2i\pi\alpha u(u+2y+k)} \\ &= \sum_{u=1-M}^{M-1} \sum_{y=\max(1-u, 1)}^{\min(M, M-u)} e^{2i\pi\alpha u(u+2y+k)} \leq \sum_{u=1-M}^{M-1} \left| \sum_{y=\max(1-u, 1)}^{\min(M, M-u)} e^{4i\pi\alpha uy} \right| \end{aligned}$$

So that in turn

$$\sup_{k \geq 0} \left| \sum_{x=1}^M \sum_{y=1}^M e^{2i\pi\alpha(x^2 - y^2 + k(x-y))} \right|^2 \leq 49 \left\{ \frac{M^2}{q} + (M \log q) + q \log q \right\},$$

or

$$\sup_{k \geq 0} \left| \sum_{x=1}^M \sum_{y=1}^M e^{2i\pi\alpha(x^2 - y^2 + k(x-y))} \right| \leq 7 \left\{ \frac{M}{\sqrt{q}} + \sqrt{M \log q} + \sqrt{q \log q} \right\}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{k \geq 0} \left| \sum_{y=1}^m e^{2i\pi \frac{j'}{D'}(y^2 + ky)} \right| &\leq 7 \left\{ \frac{m}{\sqrt{D'}} + \sqrt{m \log D'} + \sqrt{D' \log D'} \right\} \\ (m \leq D') &\leq 7 \left\{ \sqrt{D'} + 2\sqrt{D' \log D'} \right\} \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon (D')^{1/2+\varepsilon} \leq C_\varepsilon (D)^{1/2+\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this estimate into (2.35) leads to

$$\sup_{0 \leq j < D} \sup_{0 \leq k \leq m-n} \left| \sum_{h=0}^n 2^{-n} C_n^h e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(h^2 + kh)} - \frac{1}{D} \sum_{y=1}^D e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(y^2 + ky)} \right| \leq C_\varepsilon \left(\frac{D^{1+\varepsilon}}{n} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (2.36)$$

Thereby in view of (2.32), (2.36)

$$\sup_{0 \leq k \leq m-n} \left| \frac{1}{D} \sum_{j=0}^{D-1} \sum_{h=0}^n 2^{-n} C_n^h e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{D}(h^2 + kh)} - \frac{\rho_k(D)}{D} \right| \leq C_\varepsilon \left(\frac{D^{1+\varepsilon}}{n} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (2.37)$$

If now we combine (2.37) with (2.28), we obtain

Proposition 2.14.

$$\left| \mathbf{P}\{D|B_n B_m\} - \sum_{k=0}^{m-n} \frac{C_{m-n}^k}{2^{(m-n)}} \frac{\rho_k(D)}{D} \right| \leq C_\varepsilon \left(\frac{D^{1+\varepsilon}}{n} \right)^{1/2}.$$

■

Remarks.

- 1 . It is possible ([S2]) to replace the error term D^ε in Proposition 2.14 by a $(\log D)^2$ factor.
- 2 . One can bound the difference between $\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m))$ and $\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m'))$ once m, m' are not too close to n . Indeed, one can prove that there exists n_0 , such that if $m' \geq m \geq n + n_0$, then

$$\left| \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) - \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m')) \right| \leq C \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (2.38)$$

In view of Lemma 2.3, $\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m))$ equals to

$$\frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2 \\ 1 \leq |j| < d/2}} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \left\{ \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) - \cos^n \frac{\pi j}{d} \cos^n \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right\}$$

So that for $n \leq m \leq m'$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) - \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m')) &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2 \\ 1 \leq |j| < d/2}} \left\{ \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) - \cos^n \frac{\pi j}{d} \cos^n \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right\} \\ &\quad \times e^{i\pi \frac{j}{d} n} \left[e^{i\pi \frac{h}{\delta} m} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} - e^{i\pi \frac{h}{\delta} m'} \cos^{m'-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\left| \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) - \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m')) \right| \leq \frac{2}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2 \\ 1 \leq |j| < d/2}} \left| \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} - e^{i\pi \frac{h}{\delta} (m'-m)} \cos^{m'-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \right|. \quad (2.39)$$

In view of (2.13) and Case I of the proof of Theorem 2.4, if $\frac{\pi h}{\delta} \in I'_{m-n}$, then $|\cos \frac{\pi h}{\delta}| \leq \cos \varphi_{m-n}$. And so, for some n_0 sufficiently large, and $m-n \geq n_0$,

$$|\cos \frac{\pi h}{\delta}|^{m'-n} \leq |\cos \frac{\pi h}{\delta}|^{m-n} \leq \cos^{m-n} \varphi_{m-n} = e^{-2(m-n) \sin^2(\varphi_{m-n}/2)} \leq (m-n)^{-\beta'}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |j| < \frac{d}{2}, 1 \leq |h| < \frac{\delta}{2} \\ \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \in I'_{m-n}}} \left| \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} - e^{i\pi \frac{h}{\delta} (m'-m)} \cos^{m'-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \right| \\ \leq \frac{2}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |j| < \frac{d}{2}, 1 \leq |h| < \frac{\delta}{2} \\ \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \in I'_{m-n}}} (|\cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta}| + |\cos^{m'-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta}|) \leq 4(m-n)^{-\beta'}. \end{aligned}$$

Further

$$\frac{2}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |j| < \frac{d}{2} \\ 1 \leq |h| < \frac{\delta}{2} \\ \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \in I_{m-n}}} \left| \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} - e^{i\pi \frac{h}{\delta} (m'-m)} \cos^{m'-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \right| \leq \frac{4}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |j| < \frac{d}{2} \\ 1 \leq |h| < \frac{\delta}{2} \\ \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \in I_{m-n}}} 1 \leq C \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2},$$

since $\frac{\pi h}{\delta} \in I_{m-n}$ means $h \leq \delta \pi \varphi_{m-n}$. We therefore get

$$\left| \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) - \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m')) \right| \leq C \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2},$$

as claimed.

It remains to compute $\rho_k(D)$. The lemma below is a classical tool. For the sake of completeness, we give a detailed proof.

Lemma 2.15. *Let $f \in \mathbf{Z}(X)$ and put $\rho_f(d) = \#\{0 \leq y < d : d|f(y)\}$. Then ρ_f is a multiplicative function.*

Proof. Write $f(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \dots + a_nx^n$, $a_j \in \mathbf{Z}$, $0 \leq j \leq n$. Let $d = d_1d_2$ with $(d_1, d_2) = 1$. We first establish $\rho_f(d_1)\rho_f(d_2) \leq \rho_f(d)$. Let (y_1, y_2) be such that $0 \leq y_i < d_i$, $d_i|f(y_i)$, $i = 1, 2$.

There exists a unique integer y , $0 \leq y < d$ such that $y \equiv y_i \pmod{d_i}$, $i = 1, 2$. Now, on writing $y = y_1 + \ell d_1$

$$\begin{aligned} f(y) &= a_0 + a_1(y_1 + \ell d_1) + \dots + a_n(y_1 + \ell d_1)^n = a_0 + (a_1 y_1 + d_1 A_1) + \dots + (a_n y_1^n + d_1 A_n) \\ &= f(y_1) + d_1 F, \end{aligned}$$

where $A_1, \dots, A_n, F$ are integers. Thus $d_1 | f(y)$. Similarly $d_2 | f(y)$, and so $d | f(y)$. Now let (y'_1, y'_2) be such that $0 \leq y'_i < d_i$, $d_i | f(y'_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, and let y' be the corresponding unique integer such that $0 \leq y' < d$, $y' \equiv y'_i \pmod{d_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, and so $d | f(y')$. We have to prove the implication $y = y' \Rightarrow (y_1, y_2) = (y'_1, y'_2)$. But as $y = y'$, we have

$$y = y_1 + \ell d_1 = y_2 + k d_2 = y'_1 + \ell' d_1 = y'_2 + k' d_2.$$

And so $y_1 - y'_1 = (\ell' - \ell) d_1$. Since $0 \leq y_1, y'_1 < d_1$, this implies $y_1 = y'_1$. Similarly $y_2 = y'_2$, so that $(y_1, y_2) = (y'_1, y'_2)$. Therefore $\rho_f(d_1) \rho_f(d_2) \leq \rho_f(d)$.

Conversely, let $0 \leq y < d$ be such that $d | f(y)$. Let y_1, y_2 , $0 \leq y_i < d_i$ be such that $y_i \equiv y \pmod{d_i}$, $i = 1, 2$. Then, in the same fashion

$$\begin{aligned} f(y_1) &= a_0 + a_1(y + \ell d_1) + \dots + a_n(y + \ell d_1)^n = a_0 + (a_1 y + d_1 B_1) + \dots + (a_n y^n + d_1 B_n) \\ &= f(y) + d_1 G. \end{aligned}$$

And so $d_1 | f(y_1)$; similarly $d_2 | f(y_2)$. Let $0 \leq y' < d$ be such that $d | f(y')$, and let (y'_1, y'_2) be the corresponding pair of integers. Here again, we must prove the implication $(y_1, y_2) = (y'_1, y'_2) \Rightarrow y = y'$. Write $y_1 = y + \ell d_1$, $y'_1 = y' + \ell' d_1$. If $y_1 = y'_1$, then $y - y' = (\ell' - \ell) d_1$ so that $d_1 | y - y'$. Similarly $y_2 = y'_2$ implies $d_2 | y - y'$. Thus $d | y - y'$. As $0 \leq y, y' < d$ this implies that $y = y'$. Hence the implication $(y_1, y_2) = (y'_1, y'_2) \Rightarrow y = y'$. And we deduce $\rho_f(d) \leq \rho_f(d_1) \rho_f(d_2)$. The proof is complete. $\blacksquare$

Proposition 2.16. *We have*

$$\rho_k(D) = \begin{cases} \prod_{p|D} p^{\lfloor \frac{v_p(D)}{2} \rfloor} & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \prod_{v_p(k) < v_p(D)/2} (2p^{v_p(k)}) \cdot \prod_{v_p(k) \geq v_p(D)/2} p^{\lfloor \frac{v_p(D)}{2} \rfloor} & \text{if } k \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

In particular, if D is squarefree, then $\rho_0(D) = 1$.

Proof. Let us first consider the case: $1 \leq k \leq m - n$, which is the main case. In view of Lemma 2.15, it suffices to compute $\rho_k(p^r)$. Make a first observation:

$$\rho_k(p^r) = 2, \quad r = 1, 2, \dots \quad \text{if } p \nmid k.$$

Indeed, if $(y, p) = 1$, then $p^r | y + k$ and there is only one solution given by $y \equiv -k \pmod{p^r}$. If $y = p^s Y$, $(Y, p) = 1$, $1 \leq s < r$, then $p^r | y(y + k) \Leftrightarrow p^{r-s} | (p^s Y + k)$. And so $p | k$, which was excluded. There is thus no solution of this kind. Finally, it remains one extra solution $y = p^r$. Thus $\rho_k(p^r) = 2$.

We thus concentrate on the case $p | k$. We can range the solutions y of the equation $p^r | y(y + k)$ in disjoint classes of type $y = p^s Y$, with $(Y, p) = 1$. When $r = 1, 2$ or 3 , there is a direct computation and one find

$$\rho_k(p^r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r = 1, \\ p & \text{if } r = 2, \\ 2p & \text{if } r = 3, v_p(k) = 1. \\ p & \text{if } r = 3, v_p(k) \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (2.40)$$

Suppose now that $r \geq 4$ and put

$$r' = \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor.$$

We have $\rho_k(p^r) = \#\{1 \leq y \leq p^r : p^r | y(y+k)\}$. If $(y, p) = 1$, then $p^r | y(y+k) \Leftrightarrow p^r | y+k$ and so $p | y$, which is excluded and there is no solution of this type. Apart from the trivial solution $y = p^r$, the other possible solutions are of type $y = p^s Y$, $(Y, p) = 1$, $1 \leq s < r$; and we shall distinguish three cases:

$$i) \ r' < s < r, \quad ii) \ s = r', \quad iii) \ 1 \leq s < r'.$$

i) Since $r' < s < r$, then $r/2 \leq s$, and so $1 \leq r-s \leq s$. Further $p^r | y(y+k)$ means $p^{r-s} | Y(p^s Y + k)$ or $p^{r-s} | p^s Y + k$, which is possible if and only if $p^{r-s} | k$, namely $r-s \leq v_p(k)$. Thus

$$\max(r' + 1, r - v_p(k)) \leq s < r.$$

We have $Y \leq p^{r-s}$, $(Y, p^{r-s}) = 1$. Their number is $\phi(p^{r-s})$ where ϕ is Euler's function, and since $\phi(p^{r-s}) = p^{r-s}(1 - \frac{1}{p})$, the corresponding number of solutions is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\max(r'+1, r-v_p(k)) \leq s \leq r-1} p^{r-s}(1 - \frac{1}{p}) &= (1 - \frac{1}{p}) \sum_{1 \leq v \leq (r-r'-1) \wedge v_p(k)} p^v \\ &= p^{\lfloor \frac{r-1}{2} \rfloor \wedge v_p(k)} \frac{p^{\lfloor \frac{r-1}{2} \rfloor \wedge v_p(k)} - 1}{p - 1} (1 - \frac{1}{p}) = p^{\lfloor \frac{r-1}{2} \rfloor \wedge v_p(k)} - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.41)$$

ii) We consider solutions of type $y = p^{r'} Y$, $(Y, p) = 1$.

— If r is odd, $r = 2r' + 1$, then $p^{2r'+1} | p^{r'} Y(p^{r'} Y + k)$ means $p^{r'+1} | (p^{r'} Y + k)$. So $p^{r'} | k$ and thereby $v_p(k) \geq r'$. If $v_p(k) < r'$, there is thus no solution. If $v_p(k) > r'$, this implies that $p | Y$ which is impossible and there is again no solution.

The remaining case $v_p(k) = r'$ will be the only one providing solutions. Write $k = p^{r'} K$, $(K, p) = 1$, then $p | Y + K$. Since $(K, p) = 1$, the solutions are the numbers Y such that $1 \leq Y \leq p^{r'+1}$ and $Y \equiv -K \pmod{p}$. Let $1 \leq \kappa < p$ be such that $K \equiv \kappa \pmod{p}$. The number of solutions is

$$\#\{Y \leq p^{r'+1} : Y \equiv -K \pmod{p}\} = \#\{(p - \kappa) + jp : 0 \leq j < p^{r'}\} = p^{r'}. \quad (2.42)$$

— If r is even, $r = 2r'$, then $p^{2r'} | p^{r'} Y(p^{r'} Y + k)$ reduces to $p^{r'} | (p^{r'} Y + k)$, so $p^{r'} | k$. If $v_p(k) < r'$, there is no solution. If $v_p(k) \geq r'$, write $k = p^{r'} K$, $(K, p) = 1$, this is always realized and the number of solutions is

$$\#\{Y \leq p^{r'} : (Y, p) = 1\} = \phi(p^{r'}) = p^{r'}(1 - \frac{1}{p}).$$

iii) We consider the last type of solutions: $y = p^s Y$, $(Y, p) = 1$, $1 \leq s < r'$. Notice first, since $s < r'$ that $s < r/2$, and so $r-s > r/2 > s$. As $p^r | y(y+k)$ means $p^{r-s} | Y p^s + k$, we deduce that $p^s | k$, namely $s \leq v_p(k)$. If $v_p(k) < s$, there is no solution. If $v_p(k) > s$, then $p | Y$ which is impossible.

If $s = v_p(k)$, which requires $v_p(k) < r'$, write $k = p^{v_p(k)} K$, $(K, p) = 1$. Then we get the equation $p^{r-2v_p(k)} | Y + K$, so $Y \equiv -K \pmod{p^{r-2v_p(k)}}$. Notice that if Y is a solution, then

$(Y, p) = 1$, since $(K, p) = 1$. Let $1 \leq \kappa < p^{r-2v_p(k)}$ be such that $K \equiv \kappa \pmod{p^{r-2v_p(k)}}$. The number of solutions is

$$\begin{aligned} \#\{Y \leq p^{r-v_p(k)} : Y \equiv -K \pmod{p^{r-2v_p(k)}}\} &= \#\{(p^{r-2v_p(k)} - \kappa) + jp^{r-2v_p(k)} : 0 \leq j < p^{v_p(k)}\} \\ &= p^{v_p(k)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.43)$$

Summarizing the case $r \geq 4$, if r is odd, $r = 2r' + 1$

$$\rho_k(p^r) = \begin{cases} 2p^{v_p(k)} & \text{if } 1 \leq v_p(k) \leq r', \\ p^{r'} & \text{if } v_p(k) > r'. \end{cases} \quad (2.44)$$

And if r is even, $r = 2r'$

$$\rho_k(p^r) = \begin{cases} 2p^{v_p(k)} & \text{if } 1 \leq v_p(k) < r', \\ p^{r'} & \text{if } v_p(k) \geq r'. \end{cases} \quad (2.45)$$

This remains true if $r = 1, 2, 3$. Observe that $(v_p(k) < r', r \text{ even})$ or $(v_p(k) \leq r', r \text{ odd})$ are equivalent to $v_p(k) < \frac{r}{2}$. Therefore, for $r \geq 2$

$$\rho_k(p^r) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } p \nmid k, \\ 2p^{v_p(k)} & \text{if } v_p(k) < \frac{r}{2}, \\ p^{\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor} & \text{if } v_p(k) \geq \frac{r}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (2.46)$$

Consequently

$$\rho_k(D) = \prod_{p|D} \rho_k(p^{v_p(D)}) = \prod_{v_p(k) < v_p(D)/2} (2p^{v_p(k)}) \cdot \prod_{v_p(k) \geq v_p(D)/2} p^{\lfloor \frac{v_p(D)}{2} \rfloor}. \quad (2.47)$$

Finally, consider the case $k = 0$, namely $\rho_0(p^r) = \#\{1 \leq y \leq p^r : p^r | y^2\}$. Notice that $\rho_0(p) = \#\{1 \leq y \leq p : p | y\} = 1$. Let $r > 1$, and write $y = p^s Y$, $(Y, p) = 1$ and $1 \leq s \leq r$. If $s = r$, there is the trivial unique solution $y = p^r$. If $1 \leq s < r$, $p^r | y^2 \Rightarrow 2s \geq r$, in which case, the number of solutions is

$$\#\{Y \leq p^{r-s} : (Y, p) = 1\} = \phi(p^{r-s}) = p^{r-s} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right). \quad (2.48)$$

Consequently $\rho_0(p^r) = 1 + \sum_{r/2 \leq s < r} p^{r-s} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)$. If r is even, $r = 2r'$

$$\rho_0(p^r) = 1 + \sum_{\sigma=1}^{r'} p^\sigma \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = 1 + p \sum_{u=0}^{r'-1} p^u \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = 1 + p \left(\frac{p^{r'} - 1}{p - 1}\right) \left(\frac{p - 1}{p}\right) = p^{r'},$$

whereas if r is odd, $r = 2r' + 1$, $\rho_0(p^r) = 1 + \sum_{\sigma=1}^{r'} p^\sigma \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = p^{r'}$. Thus

$$\rho_0(p^r) = p^{\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor}.$$

It follows that

$$\rho_0(D) = \prod_{p|D} p^{\lfloor \frac{v_p(D)}{2} \rfloor}. \quad (2.49)$$

The proof is now complete. ■

We deduce

Corollary 2.17. *We have for any positive integer D and any integer k ,*

$$\rho_k(D) \leq 2^{\omega(D)}(k \wedge \sqrt{D}), \quad \rho_0(D) \leq \sqrt{D}.$$

Proof. Immediate.

Corollary 2.18. *We have for any positive integers n, m and D ,*

$$\mathbf{P}\{D|B_n B_m\} \leq \frac{1}{2^{m-n}\sqrt{D}} + \frac{2^{\omega(D)}(m-n)}{D} + C_\varepsilon \frac{D^{1/2+\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Further, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant C_ε depending on ε only, such that

$$\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} \leq C(m-n) \frac{2^{\omega(d\delta)}}{d\delta} + C_\varepsilon \frac{(d\delta)^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Proof. By Corollary 2.17

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{m-n} \frac{C_{m-n}^k \rho_k(D)}{2^{m-n} D} &= \frac{\rho_0(D)}{2^{m-n} D} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-n} \frac{C_{m-n}^k \rho_k(D)}{2^{m-n} D} \leq \frac{1}{2^{m-n}\sqrt{D}} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-n} \frac{C_{m-n}^k}{2^{m-n}} \frac{2^{\omega(D)} k}{D} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^{m-n}\sqrt{D}} + \frac{2^{\omega(D)}(m-n)}{D}. \end{aligned}$$

On using Proposition 2.19, we get

$$\mathbf{P}\{D|B_n B_m\} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{m-n} \frac{C_{m-n}^k \rho_k(D)}{2^{(m-n)} D} + C_\varepsilon \left(\frac{D^{1+\varepsilon}}{n} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{2^{m-n}\sqrt{D}} + \frac{2^{\omega(D)}(m-n)}{D} + C_\varepsilon \frac{D^{1/2+\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

For proving the second estimate, notice first that $\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} > 0$ only if $m-n \geq (d, \delta)$, since $\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} \leq \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\} \mathbf{P}\{(d, \delta)|B_{m-n}\}$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} &= \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m, B_m - B_n = 0\} + \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m, B_m - B_n > 0\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_n\} + \mathbf{P}\{d\delta|(B_n^2 + B_n(B_m - B_n)), B_m - B_n > 0\} \\ &= \mathbf{P}\{[d, \delta]|B_n\} + \frac{1}{2^n 2^{m-n}} \sum_{k=1}^{m-n} C_{m-n}^k \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=0}^{d\delta-1} \sum_{h=0}^n C_n^h e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{d\delta} (h^2 + kh)}. \end{aligned}$$

By (1.15), $\mathbf{P}\{[d, \delta]|B_n\} \leq C\left(\frac{1}{[d, \delta]} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \leq C\left(\frac{m-n}{d\delta} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$. And by using (2.37) and Corollary 2.17

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{2^n 2^{m-n}} \sum_{k=1}^{m-n} C_{m-n}^k \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{j=0}^{d\delta-1} \sum_{h=0}^n C_n^h e^{2i\pi \frac{j}{d\delta} (h^2 + kh)} \right| &\leq C_\varepsilon \frac{(d\delta)^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{2^{m-n}} \sum_{k=1}^{m-n} \frac{\rho_k(d\delta)}{d\delta} \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon \frac{(d\delta)^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{2^{m-n}} \sum_{k=1}^{m-n} \frac{2^{\omega(d\delta)}(k \wedge \sqrt{d\delta})}{d\delta} \leq C_\varepsilon \frac{(d\delta)^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + (m-n) \frac{2^{\omega(d\delta)}}{d\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} &\leq C\left(\frac{m-n}{d\delta} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + (m-n) \frac{2^{\omega(d\delta)}}{d\delta} + C_\varepsilon \frac{(d\delta)^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &\leq C(m-n) \frac{2^{\omega(d\delta)}}{d\delta} + C_\varepsilon \frac{(d\delta)^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

■

Proof of Proposition 2.10. It suffices now to put together Propositions 2.14, 2.16 and Corollary 2.18. $\blacksquare$

We conclude this section by indicating another correlation estimate controlling the difference between $\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m))$ and $\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m'))$ once m, m' are not too close to n .

Proposition 2.19. *For some n_0 sufficiently large, and $m' \geq m \geq n + n_0$,*

$$\left| \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) - \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m')) \right| \leq C \left(\frac{\log(m - n)}{m - n} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. In view of (2.12)

$$\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) = \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2 \\ 1 \leq |j| < d/2}} e^{i\pi(\frac{j}{d}n + \frac{h}{\delta}m)} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \left\{ \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) - \cos^n \frac{\pi j}{d} \cos^n \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right\}.$$

So that for $n \leq m \leq m'$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) - \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m')) &= \frac{1}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2 \\ 1 \leq |j| < d/2}} \left\{ \cos^n \pi \left(\frac{j}{d} + \frac{h}{\delta} \right) - \cos^n \frac{\pi j}{d} \cos^n \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right\} \\ &\quad \times e^{i\pi \frac{j}{d}n} \left[e^{i\pi \frac{h}{\delta}m} \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} - e^{i\pi \frac{h}{\delta}m'} \cos^{m'-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then we may bound this difference as follows:

$$\left| \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) - \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m')) \right| \leq \frac{2}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |h| < \delta/2 \\ 1 \leq |j| < d/2}} \left| \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} - e^{i\pi \frac{h}{\delta}(m'-m)} \cos^{m'-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \right|.$$

In view of (2.13) and Case I of the proof of Proposition 2.1, if $\frac{\pi h}{\delta} \in I'_{m-n}$, then $|\cos \frac{\pi h}{\delta}| \leq \cos \varphi_{m-n}$. And so, for some n_0 sufficiently large, and $m - n \geq n_0$,

$$\left| \cos \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right|^{m'-n} \leq \left| \cos \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \right|^{m-n} \leq \cos^{m-n} \varphi_{m-n} = e^{-2(m-n) \sin^2(\varphi_{m-n}/2)} \leq (m - n)^{-\beta'}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |j| < \frac{d}{2} \\ 1 \leq |h| < \frac{\delta}{2} \\ \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \in I'_{m-n}}} \left| \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} - e^{i\pi \frac{h}{\delta}(m'-m)} \cos^{m'-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \right| \\ \leq \frac{2}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |j| < \frac{d}{2} \\ 1 \leq |h| < \frac{\delta}{2} \\ \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \in I'_{m-n}}} (|\cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta}| + |\cos^{m'-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta}|) \leq 4(m - n)^{-\beta'}. \end{aligned}$$

Further

$$\frac{2}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |j| < \frac{d}{2} \\ 1 \leq |h| < \frac{\delta}{2} \\ \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \in I_{m-n}}} \left| \cos^{m-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} - e^{i\pi \frac{h}{\delta}(m'-m)} \cos^{m'-n} \pi \frac{h}{\delta} \right| \leq \frac{4}{d\delta} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |j| < \frac{d}{2} \\ 1 \leq |h| < \frac{\delta}{2} \\ \frac{\pi h}{\delta} \in I_{m-n}}} 1 \leq C \left(\frac{\log(m - n)}{m - n} \right)^{1/2},$$

since $\frac{\pi h}{\delta} \in I_{m-n}$ means $h \leq \delta \pi \varphi_{m-n}$. We therefore get

$$\left| \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) - \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m')) \right| \leq C \left(\frac{\log(m - n)}{m - n} \right)^{1/2},$$

as claimed. $\blacksquare$

3. Increments of sums of divisors of Bernoulli sums.

Let $0 < \theta < 1/6$. Put for any positive integer n

$$H_n = H_n(\mathcal{D}, \theta) = \sum_{d \leq n^\theta, d \in \mathcal{D}} (\mathbf{1}_{d|B_n} - \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\}).$$

Let also an increasing sequence $\mathcal{N}$ satisfying the growth condition $\mathcal{G}_\rho$ for some $\rho > 0$. Let $\eta > 0$ and put

$$\tilde{H}_n = \tilde{H}_n(\mathcal{D}) = \sum_{d < \eta \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}}, d \in \mathcal{D}} (\mathbf{1}_{d|B_n} - \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n\}).$$

In this section we establish the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *a) For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist constants C_ε and i_ε , such that for every i and j with $\min(i, j - i) \geq i_\varepsilon$,*

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{i \leq n \leq j} H_n \right)^2 \leq C_\varepsilon \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} n^\varepsilon.$$

b) There exist constants $\eta_0 > 0$, $C < \infty$ such that for $\eta \leq \eta_0$ and $j \geq i$

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \tilde{H}_n \right)^2 \leq C \sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} (\log n)^4.$$

Proof. We rewrite $\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{i \leq n \leq j} H_n \right)^2$ as follows

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{i \leq n \leq j} H_n \right)^2 = \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} \mathbf{E} H_n^2 + 2 \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} \sum_{n < m \leq j} \mathbf{E} H_n H_m := A + 2B. \quad (3.1)$$

For the other increment $\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{i \leq n \leq j} \tilde{H}_n \right)^2$ we operate identically. Let $0 < c < 1/5$ and choose $H = 4c$. We split the sum B into two subsums as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} \sum_{n < m \leq j} \sum_{\substack{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) = \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} \sum_{n < m \leq n + n^H} \sum_{\substack{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) \\ &+ \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} \sum_{n + n^H < m \leq j} \sum_{\substack{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) := B_1 + B_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

The sum B_1 is really typical from the "small increments" case. And we will see that this sum, which will be examined by means of Proposition 2.10, produces the strongest contribution. Concerning the sum B_2 , let $\delta_1 > 2$ arbitrary but fixed. By Propositions 2.5 and 2.9, we know that there exist constants n_0, C such that for any $n \geq n_0$,

$$\sup_{\substack{d < \frac{\pi}{\delta_1 \sqrt{\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ \delta < \frac{\pi}{\delta_1 \sqrt{\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}}}} |\Delta((d, n), (\delta, m))| \leq \begin{cases} Cn \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/c} & \text{if } n + n^c \leq m \leq 2n, \\ Cn \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/2c} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} & \text{if } m \geq 2n. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

(1) **Estimating the sum B_2 .** We claim that

$$\sum_{i \leq n \leq j} \sum_{n+n^H < m \leq j} \sum_{\substack{d < \frac{\pi}{\delta_1 \sqrt{\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ \delta < \frac{\pi}{\delta_1 \sqrt{\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}}}} \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) \leq C(j-i). \quad (3.4)$$

— If $j \leq 2i$, using (3.3) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} \sum_{n+n^H < m \leq j} \sum_{\substack{d < \frac{\pi}{\delta_1 \sqrt{\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ \delta < \frac{\pi}{\delta_1 \sqrt{\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}}}} n \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/c} &\leq C \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} n^{2-H/c} (\log n)^{1/c-2} \sum_{n+n^H < m \leq j} 1 \\ &\leq C(j-i) \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} n^{-2} \log^{1/c-2} n \leq C(j-i). \end{aligned}$$

— And if $j \geq 2i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} \sum_{\min(2n, j) < m \leq j} \sum_{\substack{d < \frac{\pi}{\delta_1 \sqrt{\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ \delta < \frac{\pi}{\delta_1 \sqrt{\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}}}} n \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/2c} \left(\frac{\log(m-n)}{m-n} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} n^{3/2-1/2c} (\log n)^{1/2c-1/2} \sum_{\min(2n, j) < m \leq j} \left(\frac{m}{\log m} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log m}{m} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{3/2-1/2c} (\log n)^{1/2c-1/2} \sum_{\min(2n, j) < m \leq j} 1 \leq C(j-i), \end{aligned}$$

since $c < 1/5$.

Remark. — Let $0 < \theta < 1/2$. It also follows from (3.4) that

$$\sum_{i \leq n \leq j} \sum_{n+n^H < m \leq j} \sum_{\substack{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) \leq C_\theta(j-i). \quad (3.5a)$$

— Let $\mathcal{N}$ be an increasing sequence of integers. It also follows trivially from (3.4) that

$$\sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \sum_{\substack{n+n^H < m \leq j \\ m \in \mathcal{N}}} \sum_{\substack{d < \frac{\pi}{\delta_1 \sqrt{\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ \delta < \frac{\pi}{\delta_1 \sqrt{\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}} \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) \leq C \sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} 1. \quad (3.5b)$$

(2) **Estimating the sum B_1 .** Let $h > 0$ be some small number. By Proposition 2.10,

$$\mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} \leq C \frac{(m-n)2^{\omega(d\delta)}}{d\delta} + C_h \frac{(d\delta)^{(1+h)/2}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n < m \leq n+n^H}} \sum_{\substack{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) \leq \sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n < m \leq n+n^H}} \sum_{\substack{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \mathbf{P}\{d|B_n, \delta|B_m\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n < m \leq n+n^H}} \sum_{\substack{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \left(C(m-n) \frac{2^{\omega(d\delta)}}{d\delta} + C_h \frac{(d\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}+h}}{\sqrt{n}} \right) := B_1^1 + B_1^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

For the sum B_1^2 we have since $\theta < 1/6$

$$B_1^2 = \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} \sum_{n < m \leq n+n^H} \sum_{\substack{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \frac{(d\delta)^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}}{n^{1/2}} \leq \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} n^{\theta(3+\varepsilon)+H-1/2} \leq C_\theta(j-i), \quad (3.7)$$

if $\varepsilon, c, (H = 4c)$ are small enough, which we do assume. For the sum B_1^1 , we have

$$\sum_{\substack{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \frac{2^{\omega(d\delta)}}{d\delta} \leq 2 \sum_{D \leq (nm)^\theta} \#\{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta : D = d\delta\} \cdot \frac{2^{\omega(D)}}{D} \quad (3.8)$$

But $D = d\delta$ occurs, given d , only for one choice of δ : $\delta = D/d$. Further, the number of possible d cannot exceed the number of divisors of D : $d(D)$. Thus $\#\{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta : D = d\delta\} \leq \#\{d, \delta : D = d\delta\} \leq d(D)$. And it is well-known that $d(N) = \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(N^\varepsilon)$. Thereby $d(D) = \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(D^\varepsilon)$, for D large, say $D \geq \Delta_c$. And so, if $D \geq \Delta_c$

$$d(D) \leq C_c D^c \leq C_c n^c.$$

Obviously

$$\sum_{D < \Delta_c} \#\{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta : D = d\delta\} \cdot \frac{2^{\omega(D)}}{D} \leq \sum_{D < \Delta_c} d(D) \cdot \frac{2^{\omega(D)}}{D} \leq K(\Delta_c),$$

whereas

$$\sum_{\Delta_c \leq D \leq (nm)^\theta} \#\{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta : D = d\delta\} \cdot \frac{2^{\omega(D)}}{D} \leq C_c n^c \sum_{D \leq 2n^{2\theta}} \frac{2^{\omega(D)}}{D},$$

Put for a while $F(x) = \sum_{k \leq x} \frac{2^{\omega(k)}}{k}$, and recall ([T] p. 60 Exercise 5) that

$$F(x) = \frac{C_0}{8 \log 2} x (\log x)^2 + \mathcal{O}(x \log x), \quad C_0 = \prod_{p > 2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p(p-2)}\right).$$

Using Abel summation, we deduce that

$$\sum_{2 \leq D \leq N} \frac{2^{\omega(D)}}{D} = -\frac{F(1)}{2} + \sum_{j=2}^{N-1} \frac{F(j)}{j(j+1)} + \frac{F(N)}{N} \leq C \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{(\log j)^2}{j} \leq C(\log N)^3. \quad (3.9)$$

Hence

$$\sum_{\substack{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \frac{2^{\omega(d\delta)}}{d\delta} \leq \sum_{D \leq (nm)^\theta} \frac{2^{\omega(D)}}{D} \leq C_\theta (\log nm)^3. \quad (3.10)$$

Summarizing, for n large

$$\begin{aligned} B_1^1 &= \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} \sum_{n < m \leq n+n^H} \sum_{\substack{d \leq n^\theta, \delta \leq m^\theta \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \frac{2^{\omega(d\delta)}(m-n)}{d\delta} \leq C_{\theta,c} \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} n^c \sum_{n < m \leq n+n^H} (m-n)(\log nm)^3 \\ &\leq C_{\theta,c} \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} n^c (\log 2n^2)^3 \sum_{n < m \leq n+n^H} (m-n) \leq C_{\theta,c} \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} n^{2H+c} (\log 2n^2)^3. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Thereby for n large

$$B_1 \leq C_{\theta,c} \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} n^{12c}. \quad (3.12)$$

(3) Estimating the sum $\mathbf{A}$. Now we turn to the sum $A = \sum_{n=i}^j \mathbf{E} H_n^2$, and begin with

$$\mathbf{E} H_n^2 = \sum_{\substack{d, \delta \in \mathcal{D} \\ d, \delta \leq n^\theta}} \mathbf{P}\{[d, \delta] | B_n\} - \mathbf{P}\{d | B_n\} \mathbf{P}\{\delta | B_n\}.$$

In view of (1.16)

$$\sup_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{D} \\ u \leq n^\theta}} |\mathbf{P}\{u | B_n\} - \frac{1}{u}| \leq C\left(\frac{u}{n}\right) \leq Cn^{-(1-\theta)}.$$

so that

$$\left| \mathbf{P}\{[d, \delta] | B_n\} - \mathbf{P}\{d | B_n\} \mathbf{P}\{\delta | B_n\} - \left(\frac{1}{[d, \delta]} - \frac{1}{d\delta}\right) \right| \leq Cn^{-(1-2\theta)}. \quad (3.13)$$

This estimate is efficient only if $\frac{1}{[d, \delta]} - \frac{1}{d\delta}$ is small. If d, δ are coprimes the latter quantity vanishes and (3.13) makes sense. Otherwise the correct order of $\frac{1}{[d, \delta]} - \frac{1}{d\delta}$ is given by $\frac{1}{[d, \delta]}$, and is for θ small, much bigger than $n^{-(1-2\theta)}$. And then, one has advantage to use the simple bound (see (1.19))

$$|\mathbf{P}\{[d, \delta] | B_n\} - \mathbf{P}\{d | B_n\} \mathbf{P}\{\delta | B_n\}| \leq \frac{2}{[d, \delta]}. \quad (3.14)$$

According to Eq. 18.2.1 p.263 of [HW] and Eq. (B) p.81 of [R] (see [Wi] for a proof) we recall that $\sum_{n=1}^N d^2(n) \sim (\frac{N}{\pi^2}) \log^3 N$. Thus

$$0 \leq \mathbf{E} H_n^2 \leq 2 \sum_{\substack{d, \delta \in \mathcal{D} \\ d, \delta \leq n^\theta}} \frac{1}{[d, \delta]} \leq C \sum_{h \leq n^{2\theta}} \frac{d^2(h)}{h} \leq C \log^4 n, \quad (3.15)$$

where we used Abel summation for obtaining the last inequality. Thereby,

$$A = \sum_{n=i}^j \mathbf{E} H_n^2 \leq C \sum_{n=i}^j \log^4 n. \quad (3.16)$$

Combining (3.5), (3.11) with (3.18) shows that there exists a constant C depending on c , such that for i large enough, say $i \geq i_c$,

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{i \leq n \leq j} H_n \right)^2 \leq C_\theta \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} (\log n)^3 n^{2H} \leq C_{\theta,c} \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} n^{13c}. \quad (3.17)$$

Now we estimate the other increment. The major difference in comparison with the above lies in the fact that the sum B_1 disappears, once $4c < \rho$ which we do assume. We start similarly to (3.1) with

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} H_n \right)^2 = \sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \mathbf{E} H_n^2 + 2 \sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \sum_{\substack{n < m \leq j \\ m \in \mathcal{N}}} \mathbf{E} H_n H_m := A' + 2B',$$

where

$$B' = \sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \sum_{\substack{n < m \leq j \\ m \in \mathcal{N}}} \sum_{\substack{d < \eta \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ \delta < \eta \sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}} \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)) = \sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \sum_{\substack{n+n^H < m \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \sum_{\substack{d < \eta \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ \delta < \eta \sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}} \\ d, \delta \in \mathcal{D}}} \Delta((d, n), (\delta, m)).$$

If $\eta \leq \delta_1 \sqrt{\alpha}$, by (3.5b) we get

$$B' \leq C \sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} 1. \quad (3.18)$$

And in a same fashion as for getting (3.16)

$$A' \leq C \sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \log^4 n. \quad (3.19)$$

Finally

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} H_n \right)^2 \leq C \sum_{\substack{i \leq n \leq j \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \log^4 n. \quad (3.20)$$

The proof is now complete. ■

4. Growth of sums of divisors of Bernoulli sums.

In this section, we prove the main results of the paper. We begin with recalling a useful convergence result of Gál-Koksma type.

Lemma 4.1. ([We5], Corollary 1.5) *Let the random variables $\xi = \{\xi_i, i \geq 1\}$ satisfy the following assumption:*

$$\mathbf{E} \left| \sum_{\ell=i}^j \xi_\ell \right|^2 \leq \sum_{\ell=i}^j m_\ell, \quad (i \leq j) \quad (4.1)$$

where $\{m_\ell, i \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of non negative reals such that the series $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} u_\ell$ diverges. Put $M_n = \sum_{\ell=1}^n m_\ell$. Assume that

$$\log \frac{M_n}{m_n} = \mathcal{O}(\log M_n). \quad (4.2)$$

Then for any $\tau > 1$,

$$\sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq n} \xi_\ell \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \mathcal{O}_\tau \left(M_n^{1/2} (\log(1 + M_n))^{1+\tau/2} \right) \quad (4.3)$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Theorem 3.1, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and i, j such that $\min(i, j-i)$ is large enough

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{i \leq n \leq j} H_n \right)^2 \leq C_\varepsilon \sum_{i \leq n \leq j} n^\varepsilon.$$

Thus condition (4.1) is fulfilled with $m_\ell = \ell^\varepsilon$. Further condition (4.2) trivially holds. We also notice that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\mathcal{D}}(n) &= \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{E} d_{\mathcal{D}}(B_k) = \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D} \\ d \leq k^\theta}} \mathbf{P}\{d|B_k\} \geq C \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D} \\ d \leq k^\theta}} \frac{1}{d} \geq C \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D} \\ d \leq k^\theta}} \sum_{k=\lfloor d^{1/\theta} \rfloor}^n \frac{1}{d} \\ &= C \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D} \\ d \leq n^\theta}} \frac{(n - \lfloor d^{1/\theta} \rfloor)}{d} \geq C \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D} \\ d \leq (n/2)^\theta}} \frac{(n - \lfloor d^{1/\theta} \rfloor)}{d} \geq Cn \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D} \\ d \leq (n/2)^\theta}} \gg n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus Theorem 1.1 is now a direct consequence of Lemma 4.1. ■

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By theorem 3.1, there exist constants $\eta_0 > 0$, $C < \infty$ such that for $\eta \leq \eta_0$ and $j \geq i$

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{i \leq \nu_k \leq j} \tilde{H}_{\nu_k} \right)^2 \leq C \sum_{i \leq \nu_k \leq j} (\log \nu_k)^4.$$

Put $M_J = \sum_{\ell \leq J} m_\ell$, $m_\ell = \log^4 \nu_\ell$. Condition (4.2) of Lemma 4.1 is further trivially satisfied. Then for any $b > 3/2$,

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^J d_{\eta, \mathcal{D}}(B_{\nu_\ell}) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} M_{\eta, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{D}}(J) + \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon \left(M_J^{1/2} \log^b M_J \right). \quad (4.4)$$

Now by (1.12), N large enough so that there is $n \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\eta \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \geq \min\{\mathcal{D}\}$

$$M_{\eta, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{D}}(N) \geq C \sum_{\substack{n \leq N \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \sum_{\substack{d < \eta \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \\ d \in \mathcal{D}}} \frac{1}{d} \geq C \sum_{\substack{n \leq N \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} 1 \quad (4.5)$$

Hence if $\mathcal{N}$ grows at most polynomially, letting $N = \nu_J$ we get

$$M_J \leq J \log^4 \nu_J \leq C J \log^4 J \leq M_{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{D}}(J) \log^4 M_{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{D}}(J). \quad (4.6)$$

And in this case, for any $b > 7/2$,

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^J d_{\mathcal{D}}(B_{\nu_\ell}) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} M_{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{D}}(J) + \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon \left(M_{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{D}}(J)^{1/2} \log^b M_{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{D}}(J) \right). \quad (4.7)$$

References

- [BW] Berkes I., Weber M. [2007] *A law of the iterated logarithm for arithmetic functions*, Proc. of the Amer. Math. Soc. **135** no4, 1223-1232.
- [HR] Halberstam H., Richert H. E. [1974] *Sieve Methods*, Academic Press.
- [H] Hardy G.H., [1963] *Divergent series*, Oxford at the Clarendon Press.
- [HW] Hardy G.H., Wright E. M., [1979] *An introduction to the theory of numbers*, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, Fifth ed.
- [S1] Sárközy A., [1978] *On difference sets of sequence of integers*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **31** (1-2), 125-149.
- [S2] Sárközy A., private communication.
- [T] Tenenbaum G., [1990]: *Introduction à la théorie analytique et probabiliste des nombres*, Revue de l'Institut Elie Cartan **13**, Département de Mathématiques de l'Université de Nancy I.
- [We1] Weber M. [2004] *An arithmetical property of Rademacher sums*. Indagationes Math. **15**, No.1, 133-150.
- [We2] Weber M. [2005] *Divisors, spin sums and the functional equation of the Zeta-Riemann function*, Periodica Math. Hungar. **51** (1), 1-13.
- [We3] Weber M. [2005] *Small divisors of Bernoulli sums*, Indag. Math. **18** (2), (2007), p.281-293.
- [We4] Weber M., [2006] *On the order of magnitude of the divisor function*, Acta Math. Sinica **22**, No2, 377-382.
- [We5] Weber M. [2006] *Uniform bounds under increment conditions*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **358** no.2, 911-936.

[Wi] Wilson B. M. [1922]. *Proofs of some formulae enunciated by Ramanujan*, Proc. of the London Math. Soc. (2) **21**, 235-255.

ADDRESS : U.F.R. de Mathématique (IRMA), Université Louis-Pasteur et C.N.R.S., 7 rue René Descartes, F-67084 Strasbourg Cedex
EMAIL : weber@math.u-strasbg.fr